

The Review of English Studies

VOL. XX.—No. 78.

APRIL, 1944

THE ENGLISH ENCHIRIDION OF ERASMUS, 1533

BY J. F. MOZLEY

In 1522-3 when Tyndale was tutor in Sir John Walshe's household at Little Sodbury, he translated Erasmus's *Enchiridion* into English, and presented it to his master and mistress in order to open their eyes to the need of church reform. When he sailed for Germany in 1524, he left with his London host, Humphrey Monmouth, 'an English book called *Enchiridion*', and this Monmouth sent to the abbess of Denny at her request. But Monmouth had a second copy, and this he gave to a friar of Greenwich, who had asked for it, and in May 1528 Monmouth believed it to be in the possession of Bishop Fisher. Thus we hear of three copies in England, and very likely there were others, and Tyndale may have taken one to Germany.¹ Bale too seems to refer to this book when he says (*Illustrium Scriptorum*, 1548) that Tyndale translated into English 'certain small works (*opuscula quaedam*) of Luther and Erasmus'. Now the *opuscula* of Luther were certainly printed, and so I incline to think that Bale is speaking of a printed *Enchiridion*: for if the book had lurked in obscurity as a manuscript, one would scarcely expect him to have heard of it, since Foxe's story of Little Sodbury did not appear till 1563.

Now in 1533 (15 November) Wynkyn de Worde printed for John Bydell an English translation of the *Enchiridion*. It proved popular; for a revised edition appeared from the same two printers on 12 February 1534, and this was reprinted several times by sundry Tudor printers, and was also made the basis of Coverdale's *Short Recapitulation* of the *Enchiridion*, 1545. This printed translation bears no translator's name or preface, but it contains the long preface to Paul Volz which Erasmus added in the Froben

¹ The evidence from Foxe and Strype is printed by E. Arber, *The first printed English New Testament*, 1871, pp. 9 f., 13, and by J. A. Gee, *Publications of Modern Language Association of America*, June 1934.

edition of 1518; and it contains many of the glosses or side-notes which first appeared (so I believe) in that same edition. Therefore it was made later than 1518, and may it not be Tyndale's translation of 1522-3? For in 1533 English printers would have excellent reasons for suppressing Tyndale's name.

This suggestion was made long ago, but was never proved. In 1934 however Dr. J. A. Gee took up the matter and made what he calls an 'initial report'. He finds the translation to be of 'very exceptional quality', made by 'a scholar and a master of words' with a knowledge of Greek, using a diction 'altogether remarkable'; that it contains Tyndalian words and phrases, and must have been 'either by Tyndale or by someone thoroughly steeped in his writings', and that it can hardly have been made in 1533 by a follower of Tyndale, since its Biblical quotations shew so few traces of Tyndale's 1526 *New Testament*. Gee's main conclusion is sound, but he gives little detailed evidence, and so he can hardly be said to have settled the matter, though he has opened the door. Let us therefore search more closely.

The 1533 book is very rare and owing to the war is now out of reach, so we will use the reprint of it which was published by Methuen in 1905 with spelling modernized. The translator we will call X, the reviser of February 1534 X². As the 1905 reprint changes a few of the obsolete words, we will base our proof only on places where either (1) I was able to consult the 1533 book before it was put away, or (2) 1905 agrees with 1534, or (3) internal evidence shews plainly that 1905, when disagreeing with 1534, is giving the true reading of 1533.

X is a Greek scholar and translates correctly various Greek phrases of Erasmus, e.g. ἀναλφαβήτω (p. 1), ἐνέργειαν (9), ἄγονται καὶ φέρονται (11), τὴν πανοπλίαν (36), φιλαυτίαν (182). He knows his Bible and theology and is familiar with classical authors. When Erasmus quotes Virgil and Terence without naming them, X inserts the name into the text (102 f., 161, 202). When Erasmus speaks of 'tripods or mules such as Achilles in Homer, Aeneas in Virgil offered as prizes', X rearranges the words so as to shew that Achilles alone gave the mules and not Aeneas (48). Many of the glosses too contain explanations of biblical and classical allusions, e.g. Æsop's fables, Plato's myth of the cave, Alcibiades, Sisyphus, the Sirens, phylacteries, Abishag, the parable of the lilies; and these appear to be the work of X himself, since their style is his, and they are not to be found in Froben's 1518 edition.

X is very fond of inserting into the text phrases and even sentences to illustrate the meaning. Thus we find:

<Pallas otherwise called> Minerva (71); the second death <which is death everlasting> (78); the noble captain <Josue> (81); our countrymen <the

Almayns> (136); if ye be dead with Christ *ab elementis mundi* <from traditions, ceremonies and inventions of men> (165, from Col. II. 20: cf. Tyndale, *Works*, Parker Society, II, 164:—*servire elementis mundi*, to be in captivity under dumb ceremonies and vain traditions of men's doctrine).

This readiness to explain is common in Tyndale, but X carries it to unusual lengths, and gives us the impression of a man helping lame dogs over stiles. When he writes:

Paul crieth to <a certain people called> Galathas (169); crying Abba father <as a man would say Dada father> (169, from Gal. IV. 6); *riches as much as ever king Cresus had* <whose exceeding great riches is come into a common proverb> (227; X² and Erasmus have: *riches of Croesus*); sharper of sight than hath <a beast called> lynx (258),

we may think that such homely explanations would be well suited for an ignorant country knight. One sentence runs: 'We must go this way to health whether we be *knights* or plowmen' (121); but Erasmus wrote *kings*.¹ This may be a misprint, but it would be quite in Tyndale's manner to change the word to make the cap fit his master.

The 1533 book is carelessly printed and abounds in all kinds of errors. Mistakes like *groans* for *guns* (43), *unity* for *stumbling*(?) in I Cor. I. 23 (75; X² has *stumbling and falling*), *followeth* for *soweth* in Gal. VI. 8 (98), *refused* for *desired* in II Cor. XII. 8 (101), *natures* for *nations* (136), *maliciously* for *manfully* (164), *darkening* for *barking* (205), *superstitious* for *superfluous* (223), *most* for *worst* (242), *certifying* for *crucifying* (243), *lives* for *lines* (251), *guile* for *gule* (283), are common. Most of the worst blunders are corrected by X², but some still remain, e.g. *hell* in Prov. II. 19 for *her* (106, *eam*), *shewed* for *shed* (113, *infuderat*), *Danes* for *Dacians* (203, *Dacae*), *wickedness* for *weakness* (199, *imbecillitatem*), *know* for *blow*(?) (12, ἀνελωπυρῶμεν). The last is so plain that one wonders that X² overlooked it; maybe he knew no Greek. These blunders fit well with Tyndale's authorship. He was abroad, and the printers might have to print from an ill-written copy, with no scholar to correct the proofs. On publication the errors were noticed, and a man of learning was brought in to revise the book, comparing the manuscript with the Latin.

But X² is not content with mending misprints. He makes many changes of his own, not systematically but as the spirit moves him, and mainly in the middle and end of the book. He cuts out a few of X's insertions, as in the following cases:

the goddess Adrastia <otherwise called Nemesis or Rhamnusia> (119); is not thy religion preposterous and out of order <and according to the common proverb, the cart set before the horse> (155); <the intellection of> the sentence verily is this (177); thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head <that is to say thou shalt make him to love fervently> (214, Rom. XII. 20).

¹ *reges sive inopes coloni*; kings or poor plowmen—X².

But he also tries to mend the style or to bring the English nearer to the Latin, and sometimes his changes are improvements. Thus we find:

the unruly commons shall strive to go before the seniors (84; *seniors or elder men*—X²; *natu maioribus*); <fortified> with the strength of eloquence (148; *kindled with the fire*—X²; *viribus*); counselleth from her (150; *casteth off*—X²; *dissuadet*); these things everywhere Paul mingleth with other sayings (170; *stampeth into us*—X²; *inculcat*); let be afar from the ears of little bodies wanton songs of love (185; *young sucklings*—X²; *infantilibus*); but singularly we be members each one of another (211; Rom. XII. 5; and everyone the members—X²; *singuli autem alter alterius membra*); stark fools (164; *excellently unlearned and ignorant*—X²; *egregie indocti*); I call in a new [displeasure] (280; *call and provoke*—X²; *invito*).

The impression one receives from these changes is that X² rather disapproved of X's loose and exuberant methods, and though it is of course possible that X himself changed his mind and came to regard his earlier style as too free, he is hardly likely to have done this in the short space of three months that divided the two editions.

A striking feature of Tyndale's Bible translations is his delight in variations of rendering. Even when a word occurs twice in the same sentence he will change his englishing of it.¹ This too we find in X. Thus *succurrat* becomes *remember* (53, 234), *let come to remembrance* (234), *let come to thy mind* (252), *call to mind* (281). *Capax* becomes *capax* (232; *receivable*—X²), *apt to receive* (254), *large of capacity* (269). *Arma* becomes *arms*, *armour*, *weapons*, *harness*, *artillery*, *instruments* (55, 70-2). Within five pages (22-7) *admoneo* has seven renderings, *put in remembrance*, *monish*, *shew*, *counsel*, *admonish*, *give warning*, *teach*. In one and the same sentence *profanus* becomes *temporal* and *worldly* (27), *impii*, *heathen* and *infidels* (8), *tracto*, *entreat of* and *intermeddle with* (3), *stipendium*, *reward*, *meed* and in the note *guerdon* (47), and so on.

But X carries his variations further even than this. Throughout the book he gives double or even treble renderings of a single word: e.g. *puddle or sink* (75, *colluvies*), *dregs and filth* (16, *faece*), *roll, welter and tumble* (228, *volutari*), *lusty and flourishing* (254, *florida*), *erudite and clerkly* (3, *eruditum*), *caduke and transitory* (143, *caducae*), *defiled and iniquate* (153, *inquinatus*; *defiled and stained*—X²). Sometimes these doublets give richness to the style, sometimes they help the reader by placing a plain English word along Erasmus's heavy Latin one; but other times they have no rhyme nor reason. What is gained by saying *reap or mow* (98, *metet*), *motions, moving or stirring* (89, *motus*), *weening or trowing* (187, *opinantes*), *disworship, dishonour and dishonesty* (254, *dedecoris*), *condition or state* (263)?² Here is a typical sentence with the additions marked:

¹ See J. F. Mozley, *William Tyndale*, pp. 101 f., 176, 183.

² The last doublet appears also in Tyndale, *Works* III, 74.

He that before his face is most loving <and kind wisheth and> prayeth for his quick <and hasty> death (267).

Now X did not invent this habit of doubling. He took it on from the translators of the fifteenth century; we find it in Caxton and Fisher and many others. But can we find it in Tyndale? Not indeed in his *New Testament*: he is in too sober a mood; his task is too lofty. But we do find it repeatedly in his early translations from Luther: e.g. in the preface to the Cologne fragment of 1525:

without their own *merits* (*Verdienst*) <or deservings> . . . appointeth his goods to be dealt (*austeilen*) <and distributed> . . . appointed that such evangelion <gospel or tidings> should be declared . . . he swallowed <and devoured up> death (*Works* I, 9).

And in his *Introduction to Romans* (1526) we find many examples,¹ e.g.

I will therefore bestow my labour <and diligence> through this *little preface or prologue* (*Vorrede, praefaciuncula*) to prepare a way. . . . Works which spring not <of love> from the *ground* (*Grund*) <and low bottom> of the heart² . . . We find in ourselves *unlust* (*Unlust*) <and tediousness> to do good, but *lust* (*Lust*) <and delectation> to do evil³ . . . for fear of <rebuke, shame and> *punishment* (*Straf, poenae*), either for love of *reward* (*Lohn*) <advantage and vainglory> . . . might be fulfilled (*impleretur*) <satisfied and stilled> with outward deeds . . . to do the <deeds and> *works* (*Werk, opus*) of the law (*Works* I, 484-7).

And in the *Mammon* (1528) we find such instances as the following:

so *plain* (*klar*) <and evident> that it needeth not to <declare or> prove it. . . . Christ biddeth us <counterfeit and> *follow* (*folgen*) the unjust <and wicked> steward, which with his lord's damage provided for his own profit <and advantage> (*Works* I, 66 f.)

Tyndale has a curious dislike of the word *parent*. The word appears nowhere in his writings: he replaces it by *father* or *father and mother*. Nor does it appear in X: five times he has *father and mother* (84, 108, 185, 198, 255), once *progenitors* (113, of Adam and Eve), and four times *father* (75, 108, 167, 286). X² does not share this dislike and twice brings in *parents*, e.g.

Thou doest reverence to thy father and mother (108; *art under the reverent fear of thy parents*—X²; *vereris parentes*).

Of the half-dozen theological words, whose translation by Tyndale in his *New Testament* so much displeased More, only one appears prominently in the *Enchiridion*, and that is *charitas*. In his *New Testament* Tyndale always renders *love*, but X usually has *charity*, and gives *love* in only about

¹ In this work Tyndale sometimes follows Luther's German and sometimes Jonas' very free Latin translation.

² This phrase reminds us of X's 'deep bottom of the mind' (p. 184) and Tyndale's 'deep bottom and ground of mine heart' (*Works* I, 12).

³ Both X and Tyndale are fond of *delectation*.

nine places, or once in five times (e.g. 72 f., 222). This fits Tyndale's situation in 1523, when he was breaking away from his old moorings but had not yet been driven into full rebellion.

Tyndale is a great translator, but he is too ready to accept a paraphrase when a simpler and directer rendering was at hand. Thus in his *New Testament* he gives us:

Luke XXIII. 25. Delivered Jesus to do with him what they would.

Rom. III. 23. Lack the praise that is of valour before God.

Titus I. 6. *Such as no man can complain on* (faultless—1534 N.T.).

This habit is common in X, e.g.:

Charity *which one brother oweth to another* (284, *fraterna*); that famous fool *of whom is made mention in the gospel* (270, *evangelicus*); amongst the very flatterings of the nurses, *whiles the father and mother kiss them* (185, *et parentum oscula*; and *kisses of the parents*—X¹).

And here are three biblical quotations:

Rom. XII. 19. Vengeance *shall be reserved to me* (214, *mihi*; *is mine*—Tyndale, N.T.).

Gal. V. 13. Let not your liberty be an occasion *unto you to live in the flesh* (170, *carnis*; *unto the flesh*—Tyndale, N.T.).

Prov. II. 17. Husband *to whom she was married in her youth* (106, *pubertatis*).

Another Tyndalian trick is to repeat the antecedent noun in the relative clause, e.g.:

Col. I. 25: according to the ordinance of God, which <ordinance>.

Titus I. 2: in hope of eternal life, which <life>.

I Peter I. 5: through faith unto health, which <health>.

Of this I have noticed a dozen examples in X, e.g.:

the divine justice in them, which <justice> (19); subduing me to the law of sin, which <law> (98, Rom. VII. 23; Tyndale's *New Testament* lacks the added word); full also of knowledge, which <knowledge> (181); that blessed joy of pure <and clean> conscience, which <joy> (249).

Tyndale sometimes inverts the order of two nouns, e.g. he writes *deeds and words* for *words and deeds* in Acts VII. 22, *gold and silver* [1526] in I Peter I. 18, *virtue and glory* in II Peter I. 3, *pen and ink* [1526] in III John 13. Of this there are about ten examples in X, e.g. *by day nor night* (61, *nocturno vel diurno*), *life and goods* (117, *rei vel vitae*), *hot nor cold* (119, *frigidi neque calidi*), *feet and hands* (121, *manibus pedibusque*).

Thoroughly Tyndalian too is X's occasional looseness in translating the divine names. He will put *God* for *Christ*, or *God* for *Lord*, or *heaven* for *God*.¹ Here are five Bible quotations: in the first two Tyndale's version agrees with X, in the three last it translates the divine name correctly.

¹ Cf. Tyndale, N.T.: John VIII. 40 [1526]; I Cor. III. 20, XVI. 7; I Thess. II. 12 [1526]; Heb. VIII. 2.

Matt. VI. 33. Seek the kingdom of *heaven* (128, 264, *Dei*).

Rom. VIII. 35. Who shall separate us from the love of *God* (72, *Christi*).

Rom. XIV. 8. Whether we live, whether we die, *to God* <and at God's pleasure> we live or die (138, *Domino*).

I Cor. XV. 50. Flesh and blood shall not possess the kingdom of *heaven* (98, *Dei*).

Isaiah LVIII. 5. A day acceptable unto *God* (175, *Domino*).

But it is time to consider X's Bible quotations as a whole. How do they compare with Tyndale's version? There are of course many disagreements: for Tyndale translated from the Greek, but X translates from Erasmus, who prints the Latin Vulgate with few variations.¹ Thus many of X's agreements with Purvey (on which Gee comments) are at once accounted for; for Purvey also translated from the Vulgate. Nevertheless in the main X's translations are a good deal liker to Tyndale than to Purvey, and yet they seem not to be quotations proper or copying down from a book. They very seldom tally word for word, and when they do, it is in simple and straightforward sentences that almost translate themselves, e.g.:

I Cor. IV. 7. What hast thou that thou hast not received? If thou have received it, why rejoicest thou as though thou haddest not received it? (237).

The likenesses as a rule extend only to phrases or ideas or rhythms, and these are most naturally explained by Tyndale's authorship. Yet we cannot rule out beforehand the possibility that some disciple of Tyndale, conscious that he was translating from the Vulgate and not from the Greek, might prefer to translate his bible texts for himself (John Frith often does this), bringing in however many reminiscences of Tyndale that were floating in his mind. We must therefore examine some of these likenesses if we are to decide the matter.

Matt. V. 18. One *jot* or *tittle* (65, *jota aut apiculus*).

(This phrase is first recorded in Tyndale's *New Testament*).

Matt. VI. 7. *Speak not much*, as the ethnics <or gentiles> do, for they think *their prayers to be accepted because of much babbling* (58; *multum loqui . . . in multiloquio suo exaudiantur*).

Tyndale's *New Testament* has: *Babble not much* as the gentiles do; for they think that *they shall be heard for their much babbling's sake* (βαττολογήσετε . . . ἐν τῇ πολυλογίᾳ αὐτῶν εἰσακουσθήσονται).

Matt. VII. 21=Luke VI. 46. He knoweth not them which say with their lips *Master, Master* (176 *Domine, Domine*).

Tyndale's *New Testament* has *Master, Master*, but in *Works* II, 128 he gives *Lord, Lord* (κύριε, κύριε). In John VI. 68 likewise both X (52) and Tyndale's *New Testament* render *Master* for *Domine*, κύριε.

Matt. XXIII. 27. Christ called the Pharisees *painted sepulchres* (52, *dealbatis, κεκοιμημένοις*).

¹ When Erasmus differs from the Vulgate, X usually follows him, but sometimes he restores the Vulgate text, e.g. in I Thess. V. 23 on p. 105.

Tyndale's *New Testament* has *painted tombs*, but in the margin of his 1534 *New Testament* and four times in his *Works* (I, 435 [1530], 485 [1526], etc.), he writes *painted sepulchres*, and so does Frith in 1533 (*Works*, 1573, p. 67). The Wycliffe versions have *made white* or *whited*. This use of *painted* (cf. also Acts XXIII. 3) is not recorded before Tyndale.

Rom. VII. 24. O *wretch* that I am, who shall deliver me *from this body of death*? (98, *corpore mortis huius*, ἐκ τοῦ σώματος τοῦ θανάτου τούτου).

Tyndale's *New Testament* reads *wretched man* (so also X²) but otherwise agrees exactly. In rendering *this body of death* both X and Tyndale follow the Greek and not the Latin.

Rom. VIII. 31. If God be on our side, *what matter is it who be against us*? (53).

Tyndale's *New Testament* agrees, except for: *who can be*, but in *Works* III, 274 he gives: *what matter maketh it who be*.

Rom. VIII. 36. We be accounted as sheep *appointed to be killed* (142, *occisionis*, σφαγῆς).

Tyndale's *New Testament* has *appointed to be slain*, but otherwise agrees with X.

I Cor. XII. 13. For in one spirit *we be* (are we—Tyndale) all baptized *to make* (in, eis) one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, and *all we have* (have all—Tyndale) drunk of one spirit (210).

Save for the points noted the two versions agree exactly.

II Cor. XII. 7. Unto Paul was given *unquietness* <and trouble> of the flesh, the messenger of Satan to vex him withal (101, *stimulus carnis*, *angelus Satanae*, *qui illum colophizaret*).

Tyndale has: *unquietness of the flesh, the messenger of Satan to buffet me*. The Wycliffe versions have: *prick . . . angel . . . buffet*.

At p. 234 X speaks of Paul *beaten* (*colophizatus*) by the angel of Satan—a thoroughly Tyndalian variation.

Eph. IV. 16. Every joint *whereby one part ministereth to another* (211, *subministratio*, τῆς ἐπιχορηγίας).

Tyndale has: *wherewith one ministereth to another*. X² has: *ministering one to another*, and indeed he radically emends this whole quotation from Ephesians.

Hebr. XII. 16. Esau sold the right that pertained to him by inheritance in that he was the elder brother (98, *ius progenitorum*).

Tyndale's *New Testament* (1526) has: *his right that belonged unto him in that he was the eldest brother*, but his *Pentateuch* (1530) at Genesis XXV. 33 and his 1534 *New Testament* both have *his birthright*; and one would expect X, if he were writing in 1533, to use this striking word, which was likely coined by Tyndale.

At pp. 146–7 X speaks of Esau's inheritance being sold for a mess of pottage (so also the note on p. 98), a phrase not recorded before 1526.

Isaiah LVIII. 4 f. Ye smite with your fist *cruelly* (*impie*) . . . that a man should bow down (*contorquere*) his head as a <hook or> circle, and to *straw* underneath him *sackcloth and ashes* (175).

Tyndale's 1534 *New Testament* (Epistle for the first Friday in Lent) has *wickedly*, but in *Works* III, 68 he renders *cruelly*. *Bow down* is correct by the Hebrew, and perhaps X knew something of this tongue: for at p. 18 he trans-

lates *Satan* by *adversary*, which is the Hebrew meaning. *Sackcloth and ashes* is first found in Tyndale's *New Testament* (Matt. XI. 21). The two older phrases, used everywhere by the Wycliffe versions, were *hair and ashes* (so also Tyndale at Luke X. 13), and *sack and ashes*. X^s needlessly changes X's *straw underneath* (*sternere*) into *cast upon*, a rendering correct neither by Latin nor Greek nor Hebrew.

Now we see here an unmistakable connection between X and Tyndale, but of what kind? Is it a case of common authorship or of a disciple recalling loosely and at random the words and phrases of his master? Surely the former. There are several arguments tending towards this conclusion, but what is decisive is that in these Bible quotations we see the *mind* of Tyndale. The Tyndalian method and habit is there even when the words differ from his published versions. This comes out with special clearness in the two following passages:

John IV. 21-4. Believe me that the hour *shall come* (*venit, ἔρχεται*) when ye shall honour the father neither in this mountain neither in Jerusalem; but the hour *shall be* (*venit, ἔρχεται*) and now is, when the very <true> worshippers shall worship the father in spirit and verity: for *surely* (*et, καὶ*) the father *requireth* (*quaerit, ζητεῖ*) such to honour him: the father is a spirit, and they which honour him must honour in spirit and verity (151).

Tyndale has: *Trust* (*believe*—1534 N.T.) me the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain nor yet at Jerusalem worship the father: but the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the father in spirit and in *verity* (*truth*—1534): for verily such the father requireth to worship him. God is a spirit, and they that worship him must *honour* (*worship*—1534) him in spirit and *verity* (*truth*—1534).

Here both X and Tyndale (1526) vary between *honour* and *worship* for *adoro, προσκυνῶ*, but disagree in their way of doing it. The future *shall come*, in place of the present, is highly Tyndalian (e.g. John V. 25 and 28; Matt. XXIV. 42 and 44, XXV. 13; Luke XII. 40), and so is the variation *shall come* . . . *shall be*.

I Cor. VI. 16. *Remember ye not* (*an nescitis, ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε*) that he that *joineth himself* (*adhaeret, κολλώμενος*) to an harlot *is made* (*efficitur, ἐστί*) one body with her, but he that *cleaveth* (*adhaeret, κολλώμενος*) to the Lord is one spirit with him (106).

Tyndale has: Do ye not understand that he which coupleth himself with an harlot is become one body, but he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit.

Here again both translators vary their renderings of *adhaeret, κολλώμενος*, but disagree in their method of doing so. The use of *remember* for *know* is a Tyndalian trick, e.g. Rom. VI. 6 and 9, VII. 1; I Cor. VI. 9 and 15; Eph. VI. 8 f.

Turning now to the diction we are struck by a certain homeliness and simplicity, a love of plain, pointed and vivid phrases. Erasmus's style is lively enough; often it becomes still more so under X's handling. He will sharpen the meaning of a word, use concrete for abstract, or bring in

graphic images of his own. He embellishes freely and has no idea of keeping himself out of the translation. Thus we find:

*Carcase*¹ (155, *corporis*); *without degree of school* (177 *minutum*); *sluttish* (253, *sordidum*); *because thou wouldest do him a good turn* (271, *ut prosis*; for profit—X²); *canvass the world* (124, *tumultuantur*); *but an easy Christian man* (234, *parum pius*); <it is a world for to see> (29); *Oh dotypol* (261, *delire*; cf. *dote-head* in Tyndale's *Works* II, 265); <with wind and weather> (126); <by hook or crook> (226); *as tough as white leather* (161, *pertinaces*); *thou dostest* <and art mad as a bedlam man> (76); *with such a mind as he hath that would rather fight than drink* (117, *gladiatorio*); *astonied thereat* <as though thy wits were rapt> (157); <to have haply their names written in a harper's bead-roll> (48); *to say many lady psalters or St Katherine's knots* (171, *preclusas*); *with* <St John's> *gospel or an agnus dei (cruce aerea) hanging about their necks*³ (151); *thou quakest* <and tremblest for fear, thy hair standeth upright, thou art speechless, thy spirits forsake thee and> *thou waxest pale* (144); *crowned with roses and fresh flowers (adonidis delitiis)* <bathed in damask and rose waters, smoked in pomanders and with musk balls> (44); *be obedient at a beck* <nor dare to do anything except she nod or wag her head> (255).

This direct and vivid way reminds us strongly of Tyndale. So does the constant alliteration. On a single page (*Works* III, 159) Tyndale gives us: 'casting, canvassing and compassing . . . turmoiled and tossed . . . silver syllogism'. In X we find:

Politic <and peerless> (204); *redound and rebound* (210, *refluent*); *deduct* <and derivate> (156); <pastimes and> *pleasures* (286); *turned and tossed* (2); *cloak or covert* (31); *ware and wise* . . . <wittingly and willingly> (228); *cleareth* <cherisheth> and *comforteth* (140); <pride and presumption> (275); <presumption or pertinacy> (275 note); *defaced and dimmed* (32, *obscuratus*); and many more.

Gee gives a list of ten words or phrases found in X, of which the earliest known use elsewhere is in Tyndale. Here are some more:

Bringers-up (25 and Rom. I. 30); *rigorousness* (109 and Rom. XI. 22); *childishness* (276 and I Cor. XIII. 11); *perceivance* (142 and Eph. I. 8 [1534]); *cursed speaking* (91 and Eph. IV. 31); *mocking stock* (261 and II Pet. II. 13 [1526]); *jesting stock* (261 and Deut. XXVIII. 37); *mumble up* (57 and *Works* I, 146); *pill and poll* (16, 23, and *Works* I, 165); *dazing* (78 and *Works* I, 167, etc.); *iterate* (171, 257, and *Works* III, 245); *knavery* (93 and *Works* I, 263); <set up their crests>³ (164 and *Works* II, 161).

There are also in X a few words that seem not to be found at all elsewhere: *travailful* (93); *sovereign ladies* (64 and 229, = concubines); *overraging* (27); *rolls of a serpent* (43, *voluminibus*). The 1905 reprint changes the last to *coils*. Tyndale has *rolls of water* = billows in Jonah II. 3, a use also unparalleled except as borrowed by Coverdale.

¹ Tyndale has *carcase* for *body* in I. Sam. XXXI. 10-12 (Matthew's Bible).

² Cf. Tyndale, *Works* III, 61: 'Some hang a piece of St John's gospel about their necks.'

³ Cf. also X's *set up thy feathers* (275, *cristas*) and *his comb riseth* (224, *cristae*) with Tyndale's *set up thy comb* (*Works* II, 74).

The diction is very rich, and we have a long list of words of which the *Oxford English Dictionary* quotes no example earlier than 1534.¹ Here are some that I have noticed:

assimule (252), at *one chop* (265; cf. at the first chop in Tyndale Works I, 241, etc.), barbarousness (286), carenly (253), currishness (230), degenerate (8, as verb), desirousness (7), enforcements (286), esteemer (169), gorgeousness (7), grosshead (192), honeydew (59 note), imperious (36), impotent (200, =unrestrained), impropriation (216; X² omits), inaccessible (183), instituter (188 note), knappishness (214), magnificent (33), mancipate (248, as verb), medium (108, as adjective; mean—X²), monkship (284), mortiferous (256), niggish (238), of a set purpose (5), oration (156, =words: X² has words), paradox (206), partitions (105; portions—X²), unliberal (278), urbanity (93), with tooth and nail (270).

These then are the main heads of the proof of Tyndale's authorship, and I think it is conclusive. There are other points that we might raise: e.g. that X, like Tyndale, is loose in translating connecting particles, that he sometimes puts *child* for *son*, that he is fond of comparatives like *vehementer* and *discreetlier*, that he uses Tyndalian words like *pluck*, *fellow*, *indurate*, *ruffling*, *bark*, *courage and bold*, that he has the curious phrase *between both*² (130) for *indifferent*, that such a gloss as 'a pretty note for shrieves and other officers' is in Tyndale's manner. But I think enough has been said. The chief features of the book fit Tyndale; many fit him above other men; some fit him alone. The reader familiar with Tyndale's works is again and again reminded of Tyndale. We are in touch with a lively and independent mind, exuberant and sometimes wayward, with a man of learning, a great translator, a master of English, whose mind works like Tyndale's, whose utterance is Tyndale's, whose sympathies are with Tyndale. We know that Tyndale translated this work, and we cannot think of any follower of his who would be equal to this achievement. Surely therefore X is Tyndale.³

¹ O.E.D. ignores X, and is also apt to overlook Tyndale's O.T. versions, and often ascribes to later translators what really belongs to Tyndale.

² Tyndale has *between both* for *lukewarm* in Rev. III. 16. X however in quoting this text (119) has *lukewarm*.

³ Gee's argument that X must have made his translation from Froben 1518, since in the Volz preface he follows that edition against Froben 1519, seems to be unsound: for later printers (e.g. Knobloch of Strassburg in 1524) sometimes printed the text of Froben 1518 in preference to Froben 1519.

GIVE THE DEVIL HIS DUE: A REPLY TO MR. LEWIS

BY ELMER EDGAR STOLL

Il est reconnu que Satan est une incomparable création.—Chateaubriand.

Satan is the most heroic subject that ever was chosen for a poem; and the execution is as perfect as the design is lofty.—Hazlitt.

I

Though not well read in Milton's prose or in recent Milton criticism and scholarship, I feel warranted in recording my protest against some opinions lately expressed, with the apparent approval of critics or scholars, upon his great epic. Mr. C. S. Lewis has a high and merited reputation;¹ but for that very reason it is necessary to contradict him, if others do not, when he seems certainly to have gone far wrong. Criticism is, even like poetry, an art, but also a science, to which truth—the reality of the beauty apperceived—is important; and no critic is infallible. In his *Preface to 'Paradise Lost'* (1942) Mr. Lewis has said many excellent things about Milton (particularly his style) and also about poetry and criticism itself; but a few about Milton's characters that (as I think) are extraordinarily mistaken. For he pronounces Eve to be murderous, Adam uxorious, and treats the 'grand infernal peers' as unworthy of the appellation, Satan, in particular, as not the magnificent figure he has been taken to be but in many ways positively silly and contemptible.

To Satan, of course, Mr. Lewis gives most of his attention; and in so doing he, at the outset, observes a proper distinction between treatment and subject-matter.

The proposition that Milton's Satan is a magnificent character may bear two senses. It may mean that Milton's presentation of him is a magnificent poetical achievement which engages the attention and excites the admiration of the reader. On the other hand, it may mean that the real being . . . is or ought to be an object of admiration and sympathy, conscious or unconscious, on the part of the poet or his readers or both. The first, so far as I know, has never till modern times been denied; the second, never affirmed before the times of Blake and Shelley—for when Dryden said that Satan was Milton's 'hero' he meant something quite different. It is, in my opinion, wholly erroneous (p. 92).

Yet as the critic proceeds he makes Satan out to be 'ridiculous', 'ludicrous',

¹ Particularly because of *The Allegory of Love*, which I have praised elsewhere.

absurd', and so despicable that as mere art he seems quite beyond the bounds of sympathy, or even of our interest. 'The first' Mr. Lewis does not himself definitely, unambiguously deny; but, as we shall see, he does by unmistakable implication or unavoidable consequence. Indeed he raises the strange question whether the stupendous epic 'is a comic poem' (pp. 92-3). 'No; but only those will fully understand it who see that it might have been a comic poem.' And thereupon Mr. Lewis comes near to making it one, of a sorry sort.

II

'Satan is suffering', he says, ' "from a sense of injur'd merit". This is a well-known state of mind which we can study in domestic animals, children, film-stars, politicians, or minor poets.' It is 'usually laughed at'; and when armed with the force of millions, it 'escapes ridicule only by being more mischievous'. And the cause—'he thought himself impaired because Messiah had been pronounced Head of the Angels' (pp. 93-4).

No one had done anything to Satan; he was not hungry, nor overtaken, nor removed from his place, nor shunned, nor hated—he only thought himself impaired. In the midst of a world of light and love, of song and feast and dance, he could find nothing to think of more interesting than his own prestige (p. 94).

Yet not all pride, of course, is petty; and as the motive appears in Satan's first speeches in Hell, it is certainly above the inglorious level of Mr. Lewis's preferences, thus expressed. Here, if anywhere, is defiance triumphing over defeat:

. . . so much the stronger prov'd
 He with his thunder; and till then who knew
 The force of those dire arms? Yet not for those,
 Nor what the potent Victor in his rage
 Can else inflict, do I repent or change
 (Though chang'd in outward lustre) that fixt mind,
 And high disdain from sense of injur'd merit,
 That with the Mightiest rais'd me to contend,
 And to the fierce contention brought along
 Innumerable force of spirits arm'd
 That durst dislike his reign, and me preferring,
 His utmost power with adverse power oppos'd
 In dubious battle on the plains of Heav'n,
 And shook his throne. What though the field be lost?
 All is not lost; the unconquerable will,
 And study of revenge, immortal hate,
 And courage never to submit or yield,
 And what is else not to be overcome;
 That glory never shall his wrath or might
 Extort from me. . . . (I, 92-111.)

(Of the fourth and third lines from the last, quoted by Arnold as a specimen of the grand style, Mr. Scott-James¹ remarks: 'The sentiment is excellent. The moral is a noble one. It recalls all the admirable ethical qualities which Milton gives his heroic Satan.')

Fall'n cherub, to be weak is miserable. (I, 157.)
 The mind is its own place, and in itself
 Can make a Heav'n of Hell, a Hell of Heav'n.
 What matter where, if I be still the same,
 And what I should be, all but less than he
 Whom thunder hath made greater? Here at least
 We shall be free; th' Almighty hath not built
 Here for his envy, will not drive us hence:
 Here we may reign secure, and in my choice
 To reign is worth ambition though in Hell:
 Better to reign in Hell, than serve in Heav'n. (I, 254 ff.)

What a difference between the two conceptions, the critic's and the poet's! And Mr. Lewis is of the opinion that his prestige could have no other grounds than those which Satan refused to admit for the superior prestige of the Messiah—'superiority in kind or divine appointment, or both'. He is 'entangled in contradictions. He wants hierarchy and does not want hierarchy'.

Throughout the poem he is engaged in sawing off the branch he is sitting on, not only in the quasi-political sense already indicated, but in a deeper sense still, since a creature revolting against a creator is revolting against the source of his own powers—including even his power to revolt. Hence the strife is most accurately described as 'Heav'n ruining from Heav'n' (VI, 868), for only in so far as he also is 'Heav'n'—diseased, perverted, twisted, but still a native of Heav'n—does Satan exist at all. . . . As a consequence the same rebellion which means misery for the feelings and corruption for the will, means Nonsense for the intellect (p. 94).²

'Heav'n ruining from Heav'n', one may say in passing, only means that, from below, as the angels come tumbling down into Hell, it seems as if Heaven itself were falling! But the above quotations suffice to show how completely Satan is thus put beyond the reach of our sympathy, and beneath our respect, whether as a picture or a person.

And as the critic continues it is by the same process. As above, he makes no allowance for the improbabilities—the contradictions—involved in the story of a rebellion in Heaven, against a faultless, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent Deity. That, of course, when realized, is (if not an impossibility) utter wickedness and folly; and Satan thus becomes (also of course) not only the first but the worst of fools. But it is not to be realized; the poet

¹ *The Making of Literature* (1928), p. 278.

² Mr. Lewis's interpretation of this is like Mr. Williams's of chaos, below, and like that of the tempest in *King Lear* as raging in Lear's mind.

rightly and pretty effectively endeavours to keep the sympathetic and judicious reader from realizing it: and if noticed, the improbabilities are granted by the reader, the contradictions discriminately ignored. As I undertook to make clear some time ago, and as Mr. Willey, without knowledge of me, has since made clearer, the difficulty is that the seventeenth-century God is put into the traditional story, and so has to be 'deemed omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent and benevolent', yet, like Homer's Zeus (who is not given all these qualities, with story really incompatible) 'portrayed as localized in Heaven, subject to gross attacks from his enemies, and administering the universe in a manner which it taxed Milton's utmost energies to justify'.¹ The motive—the grievance in Messiah's appointment to the headship, for which Milton had no authority—has (again) to be permitted him for his story. The archangel's 'injur'd merit' is no more improbable or unacceptable than sinless Eve's resentment against the 'envious' prohibition (ix, 768–72).

Mr. Lewis, however, not content with the difficulties perceptible in the poem, goes behind it to find others of his own. Where in the lines is there any suggestion of Satan sawing off the limb—revolting against the source of his own powers, including even the power to revolt? And if there were, on whom, then, should rest the blame for it? Moreover, in making out Satan and the other rebel angels so thoroughly wicked, petty, and despicable from the beginning ('injur'd merit' appears at I, 98) Mr. Lewis not only adds to the contradictions but further misrepresents Milton's meaning. How could there have been such a set, running loose, in Heaven? Dramatic propriety is broken, dramatic development forestalled. In these early Books, as I have elsewhere said, 'They are heroes, archangels newly fallen, still severe'; 'his form had *not yet* lost all her original brightness'; and it is only later that they are really 'devils'. Now, they look before and after. They have a past to lament and a future to speculate upon, the arts—music, architecture, philosophy—to cultivate or fall back upon, as well as projects to consider, something to think about, say, or do. To have given them only ignoble occupations or pleasures would, indeed, have been to do violence to the probabilities. They were so recently from Heaven—their only Sin (though a very grievous one in the eyes of Milton and his age) being rebellion against God, apostasy. And it is not only gallant and chivalrous in a poet who is of this opinion, that in denying them one virtue he does not deny them the others; it is also fair and true—it is drama.² 'Decorum', as Mr. Lewis himself says,—dramatic propriety—'is the grand masterpiece'.

¹ *Seventeenth-Century Background* (1934), p. 252. Cf. my *Poets and Playwrights* (1930), pp. 279–80.

² *Poets and Playwrights*, pp. 252–5, from which I have taken some sentences.

More justifiably, Mr. Lewis dwells upon the fact of Satan's lying. Mr. Charles Williams, he says, 'has reminded us in unforgettable words that "Hell is inaccurate"' (p. 95). But how, one wonders, is a rebellion to be raised against an impeccable God if not by some considerable inaccuracy or misrepresentation? Certainly the poet does not dwell upon Satan's—though he mentions it—as Mr. Lewis does; and criticism, as Professor Tupper has said, is largely a study in emphasis. If Satan is granted a motive (as he must be, we have seen) so must he be his own point of view.

And uncomprehending the critic makes him as well as the 'father of lies'. 'What we see in Satan is the horrible coexistence of a subtle and incessant intellectual activity with an incapacity to understand anything.' (How could such a character be in any sense 'magnificent', or produce so tremendous a commotion?) On his first appearance in the poem there is either lying or self-deception as, before the defeated host in Hell, their Leader declares that in battle they had shaken the throne and put God in doubt of his empire; but such 'inaccuracy', after a combat against omnipotence continuing through three days, is rather excusable and (again) dramatically appropriate. 'There never had been any war between Satan and God', Mr. Lewis protests, 'only between Satan and Michael'. But how is Satan, not omniscient, to know that? The Lord had bidden Michael and Gabriel 'lead forth to battle my sons invincible', to drive the rebels into Tartarus; and they failing to do this, he is under the necessity, apparently, of sending the Son himself. That this success of the rebels was only by the Lord's 'permission' Satan had not heard, or would not have credited; and if the Leader is so weak and insignificant as Mr. Lewis makes him out to be, his boast is, in the circumstances, still more excusable, but Mr. Lewis's interpretation, on the other hand, is no compliment to the might and cleverness of the Most High.

And the 'doom of nonsense' befalls Satan, Mr. Lewis thinks, before that, when Satan, in controversy with Abdiel, denies that he was created, and by secondary hands, the Son's. All that Satan says is (naturally enough, again, for one aroused in controversy and already in full rebellion) How do you know that? He does not say anything so really silly as (p. 95) 'Well, I wasn't there to see it being done', but 'Rememberest thou thy making?' That is, 'Are you depending on hearsay?' Yet for Mr. Lewis it caps the climax that he should cry out, on Mount Niphates, 'Evil, be thou my good!' According to the critic 'it includes, Nonsense be thou my sense' (p. 96).

In the world, as we know it, such an outcry is, as I have several times noticed¹ neither logic nor psychology; for rational beings (however

¹ Cf. my *Shakespeare and Other Masters* (1940), pp. 234-40; *Poets and Playwrights*, p. 261.

irrational as we know them) do not speak or even think so ill of themselves; but in tragedy, even that of mortals and the earth-born, the invocation serves a purpose, as in the role of Iago:

Hell and night

Must bring this monstrous birth to the world's light.

A 'motiveless malignity' in the villain, as Coleridge and Lamb rightly call it, may not only provoke a bigger, more unmingled emotion, but also relieve the hero of responsibility for the villain's misdoing; and in Heaven this is still more important than in Venice.

Satan, indeed, has the same slight provocation (which, however, Mr. Lewis will not allow) of 'injur'd merit', having been passed over in the appointment, but also another motive, lacking in Iago, of defiance and despair.

Farewell remorse; all good to me is lost,

is, on Mount Niphates, his preceding sentence. Or, as he said before that, in Book I, 160, to the other fallen ones:

Ever to do ill our sole delight
As being the contrary to his high will
Whom we resist.

The archangel is, then, more reasonable, more psychologically constructed, than the Prince of Villains, who, certainly, is not ridiculous. Hazlitt, in fact, goes farther, as he says that 'Satan is not the principle of malignity, or of the abstract love of evil—but of the abstract love of power, of pride, of self-will personified, to which principle all other good and evil, and even his own, are subordinate. From this principle he never once flinches. His love of power and contempt of suffering are never relaxed from the highest pitch of intensity. His thoughts burn like Hell within him; but the power of thought holds dominion in his mind over every other consideration'. Yet that pride Mr. Lewis thinks ludicrous—to him it would be more of an injury to be hungry, overtasked, or suffering from one of the other grievances mentioned—though Hazlitt at the outset of the paragraph, too long to quote entire, pronounces Satan 'the most heroic subject that ever was chosen for a poem'.¹

The trouble is that Mr. Lewis strangely treats the superhuman character—reads the supernatural story—in the light of common sense; and that, in a supersensible world, does not prevail. The passionate paradoxes of Milton's Titanic presentation he turns into a 'personified self-contradiction'. To the vaulting desperate resolutions in the speeches quoted above and below his imagination stubbornly refuses to respond:

Who durst defy the omnipotent to arms. (I, 49.)

Vaunting aloud, but rackt with deep despair: (I, 125.)

¹ *Works* (1902), V, 64.

turbing and interfering with that impression, as in the early nineteenth-century criticism of Shakespeare. So far as in the past I have protested against some of Coleridge's or Hazlitt's interpretations of the still greater poet, it has not, I trust, been against their instinctive and spontaneous response to the poetry; and in Milton the intrusion of irrelevant learning has come about only of late, by the hand of scholars, especially the 'New Miltonians', as they call themselves, not poets or critics.

Personally, I much prefer the older scholars, such as Mackail and Raleigh, as truer to the imaginative and emotional impression and (really) to scholarship as well. Mr. Lewis, to be sure, I would not call a New Miltonian—despite what I have been saying I think by far too highly of him, and in the matter of Adam's sin as disobedience, not intemperance, taken up below, he keeps scholarship in its place—yet I would refer him to Raleigh's account of Satan (*Milton*, 1915, pp. 133-4) and quote these sentences at least:

Satan unavoidably reminds us of Prometheus, and although there are essential differences, we are not made to feel them essential. His very situation as the fearless antagonist of Omnipotence makes him either a fool or a hero, and Milton is far indeed from permitting us to think him a fool. The nobility and greatness of his bearing are brought home to us in some half-dozen of the finest poetic passages in the world. The most stupendous of the poet's imaginative creations are made the foil for a greater than themselves. Was ever terror more magnificently embodied than in the phantom figure of Death?

The other Shape—

If shape it might be called that shape had none
Distinguishable in member, joint, or limb;
Or substance might be called that shadow seemed,
For each seemed either—black it stood as Night,
Fierce as ten Furies, terrible as Hell,
And shook a dreadful dart: what seemed his head
The likeness of a kingly crown had on.
Satan was now at hand, and from his seat
The monster moving onward came as fast
With horrid strides; Hell trembled as he strode.

This is the passage that drew from Burke a rapture of praise. But as it stands in the poem its elevation is a scaffolding merely, whence we may view the greatness of Satan:

The undaunted Fiend what this might be admired—
Admired, not feared (God and his Son except,
Created thing naught valued he nor shunned).

And the great critic thereupon shows how the same 'magnificent effect of suggestion' is wrought even more subtly in the scene where Satan approaches the throne of Chaos.

Moreover, something of the same effect of contrast and relief is several times secured (as has been noticed by good critics generally, and also by

Mr. Williams¹ whom Mr. Lewis so much admires) even at the expense of the Messiah. Satan as he volunteers to seek

Through all the coasts of dark destruction
Deliverance for us all. . . .

is a figure still more intrepid and sublime than the Son, as in Book III he undertakes the sacrifice for man's salvation. Both in Hell and in Heaven the assembled multitude is stricken mute; but Satan's venture is doubtful and desperate, for 'permission' cannot be counted on; that of the Son, who is omnipotent, is assured. And Satan's comes first, is indeed the occasion or provocation of the second. Now if all such expenditure of artistic resource is made upon a figure who as he talks and otherwise comports himself is unworthy of it—is in himself contemptible—it is worse than thrown away.

And so, then, is the mere poetry. This is an 'heroic poem', and never before or since has epic grandeur been lavished as upon the fallen angels, Satan above the rest. Chateaubriand, brushing aside the question of Milton's indebtedness, exclaims:

Que fait tout cela à la gloire de Milton? Ces prétendus originaux ont-ils ouvert leurs ouvrages par le réveil de Satan dans l'Enfer? ont-ils traversé le chaos avec l'Ange rebelle, aperçu la création du seuil de l'Empyrée, apostrophé le soleil, contemplé le bonheur de l'homme dans sa primitive innocence, deviné les majestueuses amours d'Ève et d'Adam? (*Oeuvres*, VI, 207.)

And that is a matter only of incident and situation, leaving out the 'constellated glories' of their speech and of the poet's own descriptions.

III

Fallen *angels*, I have said; for the others are subjected to much the same denigrating, belittling process, which turns the heroic into mock-heroic—the unintentional variety, that is, not a delightful kind. The grand conclave of the angelic rebels in Book II, hitherto admired by everybody with taste, is now turned into a grumbling huddle. 'To rush blind-headed at the thing we have wronged, to die hitting it—this would be the best that could ever happen to us. And who knows? We may hurt it a bit before we die.' That, for Mr. Lewis, is Moloch, 'a mere rat in a trap';—Moloch, who rather than 'Accept this dark opprobrious den of shame', would choose

Arm'd with Hell flames and fury all at once
O'er Heav'n's high tow'rs to force resistless way.

¹ In his *English Poetic Mind* (1932), p. 129. In this book Mr. Williams has not yet produced his conception of Satan as 'hopelessly foolish' as well as 'inaccurate', of Heaven as 'continual' and 'irrepressible' laughter, to be found in his introduction to *Paradise Lost* (*The World's Classics*). Here (p. xviii) the contrast is, of course, in Satan's disfavour; and also another, between the two progresses through Chaos, II, 871–1033, VII, 192–221; there being also an 'interior chaos in the human soul'. Words fail me here.

Belial, who might be expected to come nearer to pleasing Mr. Lewis because warier and more sensible than Moloch or Satan, is by him treated no better. "To grow numb, voluntarily to decline to a lower plane of being, never again to admit any aspiration, any thought, any emotion which might "dispell the comfortable glooms of Hell", to avoid literature and noble music and the society of uncorrupted men as an invalid avoids draughts—this is his cue. . . . Perhaps we shall reach Parolles' state: "Simply the thing I am shall make me live".¹ Belial, the most poetical figure in the poem, and whose famous, truly 'unforgettable' words so manifestly contradict what has just been said against him:

for who would lose,
Though full of pain, this intellectual being,
Those thoughts that wander through eternity
To perish rather, swallow'd up and lost
In the wide womb of uncreated night
Devoid of sense and motion?

And as for the music in Hell, that (as we shall see, and as Mr. Lewis himself must have noted) is finer if not nobler than in Heaven; the discourse—

Of happiness and final misery,
Passion and apathy, and glory and shame—

though the Christian Milton must needs frown upon it, more philosophical. So Mammon, who in Hell would make the best of it (as Mr. Lewis apparently would have Satan do) but preferring, even if forgiven, not

to celebrate his throne
With warbl'd hymns, and to his Godhead sing
Forc't hallelujahs,

and echoing Horace before his time,

. . . but rather seek
Our own good from ourselves, and from our own
Live to ourselves—

he, saying nothing more improper than that, provokes Mr. Lewis into mockery such as this: 'What do you mean by saying we have lost love? There is an excellent brothel round the corner. What do you mean by all this talk of dishonour?' and so on (p. 103). In fact, 'all the speeches' of what Milton calls 'the great consult', are, according to Mr. Lewis, 'alike futile'.¹ But on the battlefield, contending against omnipotence, the speakers were not so futile; and thus at another point the immortal poem does not hold together.

¹ In *Rehabilitations* (1939), p. 165, Mr. Lewis was not so scornful: he speaks of Beelzebub's 'dim vastness and ruined splendour' as highly 'romantic'.

IV

Above I said the trouble was that of the rebel angels Mr. Lewis demands too much in the way of common sense. The same is to be said about morals. He seems to ignore the virtues they have—'courage', as Ruskin says, 'resolution, patience, deliberation in counsel', and he might have added, generous devotion to their leader,¹ as well as pity and remorse on his part in return.

If thou beest he; but O how fall'n! how chang'd
From him, who in the happy realms of light
Cloth'd with transcendent brightness didst outshine
Myriads though bright. . . . (I, 84-7.)

. . . and from eternal splendors flung
For his revolt, yet faithful how they stood,
Their glory wither'd. (I, 610-12.)

He now prepar'd
To speak; whereat their doubl'd ranks they bend
From wing to wing, and half enclose him round
With all his peers: attention held them mute.
Thrice he assay'd, and thrice in spite of scorn,
Tears such as angels weep, burst forth: at last
Words interwove with sighs found out their way. (I, 615-21.)

Pity for his victims, too, in Paradise (IV, 366-75, 515-20). Instead, the critic makes him there 'a mere peeping Tom leering and writhing in prurience as he overlooks the privacy of two lovers,—salacious, grotesque, a thing that peers in at bedroom or bathroom windows' (p. 97). The only warrant for these charges is that Satan, happening upon Adam when pressing 'her matron lip with kisses pure', 'turned aside for envy, yet with jealous leer malign eyed them askance', and (surely not to his discredit) laments that such bliss is not for him (IV, 503). A different impression is that of Chateaubriand, the poet (as of Courthope).

Eve séduisant un moment le rival de Dieu, le chef de l'Enfer, le roi de la haine, laisse dans l'imagination une idée incompréhensible de la beauté de la première femme.

(The kisses are 'pure', and it is drama again!) Worst of all, Mr. Lewis deprives the devils, as Milton himself—and even Dante—does not, of their energy and dignity. As De Sanctis says, 'The poetic value of a character lies not in his morality or faith but in his vital energy'. And it is a remarkable fact, not to be brushed aside, that, when considering Satan, men so widely different in gifts and taste as Hazlitt, Shelley, and Landor, Macaulay, Raleigh, and the late Professor Herford,² should be compelled to remember Prometheus.

¹ See, also, I, 662-7; II, 477-87 'rejoicing in their matchless chief'.

² *The Post-War Mind of Germany* (1927), p. 96; and, p. 98, of his companions, 'human warriors and counsellors of the grandest type'.—Macaulay (*Works*, 1898, VII, p. 27), convincingly, ranks Satan above the Titan.

So spake the apostate angel, though in pain
Vaunting aloud, but rackt with deep despair.

That with reiterated crimes he might
Heap on himself damnation while he sought
Evil to others . . .

And now his heart
Distends with pride, and hardening in his strength,
Glories.

he seem'd
For dignity compos'd and high exploit;
But all was false and hollow; though his tongue
Dropt manna, and could make the worse appear
The better reason, to perplex and dash
Maturest counsels: for his thoughts were low;
To vice industrious, but to nobler deeds
Timorous and slothful: yet he pleas'd the ear;
And with persuasive accent thus began. (II, 110-18.)

But all the rebels he makes fascinating or imposing. There is no ugliness in Milton's Hell as there is in Dante's, nothing savage or revolting, no stench or filth.² The music there is not only more spontaneous than in Heaven as reported by Mammon—but also more to our sublunary taste as reported by Milton himself.³

Others more mild,
Retreated in a silent valley, sing
With notes angelical to many a harp

¹ See my *From Shakespeare to Joyce* (1944), pp. 31, 33.

² Cf. C. H. Herford, *op. cit.*, pp. 91, 94, 96, and my *Poets and Playwrights*, pp. 275-8.

³ As at III, 345-9, though that is glorious.

Their own heroic deeds and hapless fall
By doom of battle. . . . (II, 545.)

And even better before that:

Nor wanting power to mitigate and swage,
With solemn touches, troubl'd thoughts, and chase
Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain
From mortal or immortal minds. (I, 555.)

For these are the 'sweetest songs' as Shelley conceives of them, as (though in minor key and in narrower range) he himself sang them. Nor is all for the ear in Hell. The prospect is 'waste and wild'; but there are the temple built by Mulciber, the valley, and the rivers. The angelic presences, moreover, are not yet darkened, deformed. Belial—'a fairer person lost not Heaven'; Sin, 'fair to the waist'; Death himself too vague and intangible to be ugly. And who is so sublimely and romantically depicted as the Chief?

. . . his form had not yet lost
All her original brightness, nor appear'd
Less than archangel ruin'd, and th' excess
Of glory obscur'd, etc. (I, 590-605.)

The wicked and terrible Milton makes beautiful, as the Greeks made Medusa and the Furies, and Shakespeare, Goneril, and the poet of the *Chanson de Roland*, Ganelon. There is disapproval, even horror, but no expression of contempt, because no occasion for it. 'The dignity of the damned', says Mr. MacEachren, writing of Dante; and for him, but far more for Milton, they have their beauty too. And that is not merely because art must please, must interest. 'Temptations are beautiful', as Stevenson said in reply to Tolstoy speaking to the world in his *Power of Darkness*; and Milton, the moralist, would have said the same. Sin is sweet, as the Puritan's Eve and Adam immediately found.

V

Them, Mr. Lewis treats, at first, more happily. He rightly holds that they are not meant to be so naïve and primitive as we might expect them to be, but (before the fall) perfect, majestic, and severe. (Is Mr. Lewis echoing Chateaubriand as above?) And he rightly holds their sin to be disobedience, not intemperance, as the New Miltonians would have it.¹ Though Milton in general somewhat himself inclines to the classical doctrine of reason and moderation he does not and cannot here, for so he would be running contrary to the premises or postulates of the story. It is a matter

¹ Cf. my *Poets and Playwrights* (1930), pp. 230-3. Mr. Basil Willey sheds further light upon the subject of the disobedience (*op. cit.*, pp. 256 ff.) as he shows how Milton managed to conform to the biblical conception of a knowledge of good and evil, despite his own more enlightened views.

of an absolute and peremptory prohibition, which is directly broken. 'The decreasing number of readers to whom poetry is a passion without afterthought must just accept Milton's doctrine of obedience as they accept the inexplicable prohibitions in *Lohengrin*, *Cinderella*, or *Cupid and Psyche*' (p. 70). If only Mr. Lewis himself had not given way to afterthoughts before.

Yet presently, he does so again. Eve as she determines that Adam too shall eat, and share her fate—'I am not sure', Mr. Lewis observes, 'that critics always notice the precise sin which Eve is committing. . . . Its name in English is murder' (p. 121). I for one am sure they do not; and if Milton does not see to it himself that they do, why should they? It is jealousy, of course, the thought that Adam might be happy with another woman. But it is love also, as with Adam, too, who now rises to the occasion, and is not guilty of suicide. Indeed, it is all for love and the world well lost (though both Eve and Adam before the eating doubt that death is really to come). Why should the reader be more ethical and inexorable than Milton himself? Why should Mr. Lewis thus lower in our opinion all the principal actors in the story? It spoils the story, and the poem, which is not a document, or indictment. Nor is such fierce possessiveness in keeping with the tone and tenor of Eve's utterance afterwards. In her grief she herself proposes suicide, but that is to save their progeny from the curse. And she is humble, appealing, self-effacing: it is only at the temptation—and just before, in her separation from Adam—that she is wilful; as she has to be that she, the sinless, may sin.

Between us two let there be peace. (X, 924.)

. . . that all

The sentence from thy head remov'd may light

On me, sole cause to thee of all this woe,

Me, me only just object of his ire. (X, 933.)

So, near the end:

With thee to go

Is to stay here; without thee here to stay

Is to go hence unwilling; thou to me

Art all things under Heav'n. . . .

And as Mr. Lewis himself says and reiterates, '*Decorum* is the grand masterpiece'.¹

Adam is, to be sure, uxorious in the opinion of Milton the Puritan moralist, as of the Lord:

. . . fondly overcome with female charm.

But not in the opinion of Milton the poet. As I have elsewhere said,²

¹ I have discussed Eve and Adam both much more fully in *Poets and Playwrights*, pp. 257-65; and in *From Shakespeare to Joyce*, pp. 400-10.

² *Poets and Playwrights*, p. 263.

'nothing in his life of virtue ever became him like his taking leave of it'.
There is an unwonted throb in his utterance as he cries,

How can I live without thee, how forego
Thy sweet converse and love so dearly join'd,
To live again in these wild woods forlorn.

Mr. Lewis himself, forgetting his morals a moment, responds to the poetic—the dramatic—anticipation in the Paradisiacal woods now so suddenly grown wild.

VI

Why, now, are Adam and Eve so much more interesting after the fall than before? Mr. Lewis does not raise the question. But the answer, I think, is the same as for another—Why are the faithless angels so much more interesting than the faithful? Mr. Lewis does raise the question why Satan (which at the end he surprisingly admits) is the best drawn of Milton's characters. But his answer is moral and theological rather than psychological or artistic:

The reason is not hard to find. Of the major characters whom Milton attempted he is incomparably the easiest to draw. Set a hundred poets to tell the same story and in ninety of the resulting poems Satan will be the best character. In all but a few writers the 'good' characters are the least successful, and everyone who has ever tried to make even the humblest story ought to know why. To make a character worse than oneself it is only necessary to release imaginatively from control some of the bad passions which, in real life, are always straining at the leash; . . . But if you try to draw a character better than yourself, all you can do is to take the best moments you have had and to imagine them prolonged and more consistently embodied in action. . . . To project ourselves into a wicked character, we have only to stop doing something that we are already tired of doing; to project ourselves into a good one we have to do what we cannot and become what we are not. . . . The Satan in Milton enables him to draw the character well just as the Satan in us enables us to receive it. . . . A fallen man is very like a fallen angel (p. 98).

Depravity is the reason in both writer and reader! But is there not another, closer to the facts? Satan and his followers, like Adam and Eve after the fall, are more interesting and also more appealing, not simply because they are wicked or because we and Milton are, but because they are limited, are within the bounds of Milton's and our own comprehension, those, that is to say, of art. The characters are now subject to motives or incentives, a prey to passions and temptations; but the poet's hands, at the same time, are set free. The characters are both good and bad, and there is contrast, variety; the poet is no longer painting in one colour, playing on one string. And wicked conduct interests us not so much, perhaps, because we are wicked as because we are good. It startles us,

shocks us. Indeed, it is not endurable for long unless it is somewhat mingled with good, or else is the doing of one uncommonly clever or vigorous, witty or humorous, like Iago and Richard III. Satan, as we have seen, has powers and virtues, and if not much wit or humour, has at command, as I have elsewhere shown, an arsenal of sarcasm.¹

VII

There are other recent critics of Milton whom I should be glad to dwell upon—Professor Mario Praz and the late lamented poet Laurence Binyon, both writing in the volume of *Seventeenth-Century Studies* presented to Sir Herbert Grierson (1936). Alike they have to do primarily with poetry, subduing their scholarship (as Mr. Lewis, to be sure, has generally and finely done) to the poetic purpose. Both employ a knowledge of the other arts of painting and music; but discriminatingly, in keeping with the principle which I have elsewhere² touched upon, that at a given period there is often a more ascertainable relation between the arts of the time than between poetry and the actual life of the time. And no doubt Mr. Lewis would be more affected by the poet Binyon's impression of Satan than by Shelley's or Byron's. Speaking of Milton's genius as musical rather than pictorial, he yet claims for him this faculty too, sometimes denied him. In the *Nativity* he comes upon touches that recall Giotto or Lorenzetti. But

In *Paradise Lost* and in *Samson Agonistes* it is a quite different type of form that is evoked, of ampler, even gigantic mould. There is a hint of the swelling style of the baroque (Bernini was Milton's slightly elder contemporary); but pre-eminently in the figure of Satan a tremendous presence imposes on the imagination, tremendous not only in externals but from a superhuman force and fire within. If we are reminded by this creation of anyone in the realm of plastic and pictorial art, it is not of Bernini; it is of Michelangelo, of whom indeed it might truly be said that beyond the human form he saw nothing in the world (p. 189).

And that effect cannot be one of treatment—or style—alone.

Moreover, this impression of 'superhuman force and fire' is in keeping with the tradition, from the time of Dryden to ours, which must not be ignored. It is not merely a matter of the Romantic poets and critics, of their accepted or rejected authority. 'Literature', as the late Lascelles Abercrombie well said, 'exists not only in expressing a thing; it equally exists in the receiving of the thing expressed'. It depends upon the intention of the author, but only as that is effectively conveyed. A poem implies a reader or hearer; a drama, an audience. While Hamlet and Falstaff still held the stage the one was not a morbid weakling nor the other an illumi-

¹ *Poets and Playwrights*, pp. 256-7.

² *From Shakespeare to Joyce*, p. 87-95.

nated pacifist. No artistic writer writes for himself, in Miss Stein's fashion, 'alone with English' (and still less, as the Vanguard too often do, alone without it). Here or there, of course, at this point or that (as, indeed, by the critic here mainly under consideration) new light has been thrown upon Milton's masterpiece, and will be again. But Milton, unlike Donne, unlike Shakespeare, too, is classical. His art is, in his own words, 'simple, sensuous, and passionate'; and, as we have seen, has not, until quite of late, been troubled by criticism, complicated by scholarship. And it is, in my opinion, quite impossible that for not much less than three centuries the readers of Milton should, in the mere matter of the imaginative and emotional impression of his 'glorious fiends', have been so prodigiously mistaken.

C'été
à la

It h
enli
muc
dyn
mov
hist
tim
aut
nat
inte
or
unc
me
aut
wh
mu

pe
of
H
th
(li
wi
th
T
it
M
m
R

JOHN TOLAND AND THE AGE OF ENLIGHTENMENT

BY F. H. HEINEMANN

C'était une âme fière et indépendante, né dans la pauvreté il pouvait s'élever à la fortune, s'il avait été plus modéré.—Voltaire.

I

It has become conventional to call the eighteenth century the age of enlightenment. But did not enlightenment start much earlier and last much longer? I suggest that we should replace the static notion by a dynamic one, understanding by enlightenment a permanent tendency and movement in the life of modern man closely linked up with his inner history. In antiquity man was understood as a microcosm, in medieval times as created in the image of God; modern man, however, wants to be autonomous. To be enlightened means to elect as one's guide the *lumen naturale* as opposed to the *lumen supranaturale*. True, the enlightened men interpret the 'natural light' very differently as reason, feeling, moral sense, or common sense, yet they have in common the desire to follow their own understanding, feeling, or will, and not the advice of others. 'Enlightenment' signifies modern man's coming of age, his liberation from the authority of the Church and from social forces (feudalism or capitalism), whether accomplished by an individual, a sect, a class, or the whole community.

Four stages of this development are clearly distinguishable. In the first period, beginning with the end of the Middle Ages, a few reach this stage of freedom, like Copernicus, Giordano Bruno, Galileo, Macchiavelli, Herbert of Cherbury, Spinoza, Bayle, and Locke. In the second period, the first half of the eighteenth century, select circles, chiefly aristocrats (like Freethinkers, Deists, Pantheists or Freemasons) assume this attitude without trying to transmit the light to the lower classes. In the third stage the movement becomes encyclopædic, propagandist, public and outspoken. The new class of the bourgeoisie adopts its watchword and tries to realize it. In the fourth stage the movement reaches the proletariat. Feuerbach, Marx, and Engels are its chief representatives. The idea of Enlightenment becomes the idol of the masses and the creed of the Russian Revolution. Though every one of these movements was followed by

increasingly violent reactions, we have only to-day arrived at a fundamental crisis of the whole system of enlightenment. The questions before us are: Is the age of enlightenment in the wider sense drawing to an end? If so, what was wrong with it? Was there perhaps a misunderstanding regarding its principle? If not, how have we to transform its principles in order to avoid a new dark age?

Seen under the aspect of these broader problems and related to our present situation the eighteenth century gains special significance as marking the climax of this movement and the attempt to realize its ideas in human society. Therefore it may not be lost labour to concentrate attention on John Toland, the inaugurator of the second stage. He begins with a criticism of religion and theology (just as Giordano Bruno, Voltaire, and Feuerbach do, in the first, third, and fourth period respectively). I shall consider Toland in this wider aspect and not, as it has become the custom, as a chapter in special histories of Deism,¹ Freethought,² Materialism,³ Monism,⁴ Freemasonry,⁵ of eighteenth-century literature,⁶ or of the crisis of the modern consciousness between 1680 and 1750.⁷ For none of these aspects exhausts his many-sided personality. Unpublished material, moreover, will help us in drawing a clearer picture. Who, then, was John Toland? What are his works? What was his vocation? What is his true position in the context of his age? What is the entelechy of his thought?

The necessity of a sure bibliographical basis for any thorough study of history cannot be better illustrated than by Toland's case. For we are faced with the fact that we do not even know what his works are. The first biographer enumerates thirty main items, the fourth biographer speaks of about 100 different works, and Leslie Stephen's bibliography in the *D.N.B.* contains thirty-six items.⁸ A bibliography of the original writings

¹ G. V. Lechler, *Geschichte des engl. Deismus*, 1841; J. Hunt, *Religious Thought in England*, Vol. II, 1871; E. Sayous, *Les déistes anglais, principalement depuis Toland jusqu'à Chubb*, 1882.

² J. M. Robertson, *A Short History of Freethought*, 1906.

³ F. A. Lange, *History of Materialism*, 4th ed. 1892.

⁴ G. Berthold, *J. Toland u. d. Monismus der Gegenwart*, 1876.

⁵ A. Lantoin, *Un précurseur de la Franc-maçonnerie, J. Toland*, 1927.

⁶ H. Hettner, *Literaturgeschichte des 18. Jahrhunderts*, I, 1856.

⁷ P. Hazard, *La Crise de la Conscience Européenne, 1680-1750*, 1935.

⁸ We possess four Lives of John Toland:

(a) *An historical Account of the Life and Writings of the late eminently famous Mr. John Toland*. By one of his most intimate friends, 1722.

(b) *Some Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Mr. John Toland: In a letter to S. B. L.* 26 May, 1722. Prefixed to the *Collection of Several Pieces*, 1722. Anonymously published, but written by Pierre des Maizeaux (1666-1743 or -45), the editor of the later editions of Bayle's *Dictionnaire*, who lived as a French protestant refugee in London.

(c) J. L. Mosheim, *De vita, fatis, et scriptis Joannis Tolandi Commentatio*, added to the 2d ed. of his *Vindiciae antiquae Christianorum disciplinae, adversus celeberrimi viri Jo. Tolandi, Hiberni, Nazarenus*, 1722.

(d) *An Abstract of the Life of the Author*, prefixed to *A Critical History of the Celtic Religion*, 1740. A biography based on critical principles is still a desideratum.

and manuscript-remains of Toland is therefore primarily needed, because it furnishes the only solid basis for further research.¹ At present I should merely like to draw attention to the fact that Leibniz has characterized Toland by these words: 'Il semble qu'il est positus in signum cui contradicitur'.² These words are confirmed by the anti-Tolandian bibliography, and especially by one of its items which must be mentioned here, because of its significance: John Norris's *An Account of Reason and Faith: In Relation to the Mysteries of Christianity*, 1697. This is important for elucidating the principle of Toland's philosophy, and for contributing to the dispute of reason and faith and to the critique of human reason. Norris, the follower of Malebranche, makes it abundantly clear that according to Toland human reason is the measure of truth. Yet human reason is finite, able to grasp an event only in certain connections, but never the whole reality with all its innumerable relations or the whole system of truth. It is impossible that the finite should be the measure of the infinite. Yet truth is infinite. Therefore an infinite reason or an all-comprehensive understanding would be adequate and the measure of truth, 'so that whatever this perfect understanding does not understand is not intelligible, and if not intelligible, then also not true';³ and not the human understanding, which ought to be co-extensive with truth and possess it whole and entire in order to measure it. Returning to this point at the end of our analysis we shall see that Norris is right, and that the distinction between the *intellectus finitus* and the *intellectus infinitus* which had been forgotten by the radical leaders of enlightenment is of basic importance for the solution of the central problems of human life.

II

The following account of Toland is to be found in a letter preserved in the Bodleian library.

Give me leave to divert you with a pleasant account I lately met with of Mr. T—nd's Life and Conversation. He 's of a pure Irish extraction and came into Scotland only about 88 or 89⁴ where wanting a Competent he apply'd himself to the Arch Bp of Glasgow, under pretence of being a great admirer of Church Government and Episcopacy. But not meeting with the encouragement he expected (for his Grace had been armed before hand with a Character of him, tho something he did get) he struck in very zealously with the Presby-

¹ I have made a contribution to such a bibliography in an article in *Notes and Queries*, 25 Sept., 1943.

² Letter to Spanheim, 24 June 1702.

³ *Op. cit.* p. 145.

⁴ In reality he went in 1687 to the College of Glasgow, was created M.A. by the University of Edinburgh in June 1690, returned for a short stay to Glasgow and received a testimonial from the magistrates of that town that 'he behaved as a true Protestant and loyal Subject'. From there he intended to return to Ireland, but he changed his mind, and came into England. He apparently was two years in Leiden, and in January 1694 went to Oxford. Our letter gives a more realistic background to Des Maizeaux' apologetic account.

terians, went to their meetings, and was very liberal in his abuses not only of the Arch Bp, but of the whole Order. He got a rabble together, and at the Head of them in the Market place burn't the Pope; upon which occasion he made a formal Speech against the then Magistrates o' the Town for being Episcopal (my friend promises to lay out his endeavours for a Copy of it). He fail'd not to cast in his mite when the Episcopal Clergy were *rabbed*. This I will enquire farther into. He pretended to work wonders by some secret arts, and so seduced a number of young students.

How he came into England, or the particular reason why he left Scotland, at present I can give no account; but may be able in due time. He went to Clapham, and there curried favour with one Alderman where he constantly frequented the Presbyterian meetings, and to convince them of his sincere intentions, pretended to be (or really was) under great troubles of Conscience for having ever communicated with the Bps and even to that degree, that for 6 weeks he seem'd perfectly distracted. But by the dayly endeavours of the Presbyterian Minister of the place (whose name my friend will recover; for now 'tis out of his mind), he was at last reduc'd to a very comfortable state, and restor'd to the Congregation of God's people. And (perhaps out of a sense how little he was engag'd to the Parson for doing him a kindness he had no occasion for) he made a suitable return, and after he had for some time called him *his Saviour*, endeavour'd to prove his son guilty of Polygamic, swearing judicially (for so my Author affirms) that he had a wife in Ireland, and another here: but it appear'd to be false. After this, he was taken into Madam Gold's family to teach her son at *Clapham*. She kept a Presbyterian Minister in her own house, and [in] his absence, my Gentleman officiated. He pretended the Bp of London had proffer'd him a considerable living, but alas the Conditions of Conformity would not let him accept of it. By so many glorious proofs of his zeal for the Cause he ingratiated himself with Mr. . . . (I have forgot his name),¹ a Presbyterian minister in Bishopsgate Street, who with some others of the brotherhood made a Collection of a good round summ to maintain him for two years in Holland, where he should qualifie himself for the service of the Cause here in England. But 'twas too long for him to continue in one place, so at the end of one year, he very fairly return'd; and whether the remains of that fund support him in Oxford, or he has got some new Patrons I cannot resolve you. Now I have brought him home to you, make the best use you can of him. The *Lacuna* of his behaviour in Holland Dr. Gregory perhaps may be able to make up, for he was there at the same time.²

III

The question: 'What did he make his chief aim in life?' may be answered by an unpublished letter of his written from Amsterdam 28 December 1709, in a kind of Tolandian French, probably to a German nobleman:

¹ 'Williams', written in the margin. This is almost certainly the well-known Daniel Williams, 1643(?)–1716, Non-conformist Divine and benefactor, a friend of Harley, founder of Dr. Williams's Library, London. He had been since 1687 minister of the presbyterian congregation at Hand Alley, Bishopsgate. He was accused of Arminian views and of Socinian positions on the atonement. Toland, then still 'student of divinity', tried to make return for his generosity by writing about Williams's *Gospel Truth* in *Le Clerc's Bibliothèque Universelle et Historique* (1792), Vol. 23, p. 505.

² Bodl. Rawlinson MSS. D. 923, f. 317.

Monseigneur,

Dieu et votre Altesse savent fort bien (car, pour moi, je l'ignore autant que le Diable le jour du jugement) combien de fautes il y avoit dans ma dernière, n'ayant eu assez de temps pour la relire: mais j'ose répondre pour l'incluse, que j'ay leue et releue plus d'une fois. C'est la première lettre à Serena, qui (comme j'ay eu l'honneur de le dire auparavant à votre altesse) est une espèce de préface pour les autres lettres à la même; et, si je dois le dire une fois pour toutes, la lecture de cette lettre pourroit servir de clef à tous mes autres ouvrages. *L'origine et la force des Préjugés* en est le Sujet, que j'explique tant par les raisons physiques, que par les causes morales. Un passage de Cicéron, dans son livre huitième des Lois, que je montra un jour à Serena, donna occasion à ce discours. Le voici. *Sensus nostros non parens, non nutrix, non magister, non poeta, non Scena depravat, non multitudinis consensus abducit: at vero animis omnes tenduntur insidiae, vel ab iis quos modo enumeravi, qui teneros et sudes cum acceperunt, inficiunt et flectunt ut volunt; vel ab ea, quæ penitus in omni sensu implicata insidet, imitatrix boni voluptas, malorum autem mater omnium, cujus blanditiis corrupti, quæ natura bona sunt (quia dulcedine hæc et scabie caret) non cernimus satis.*¹ Serena, admirant la force magistrale et la simple naïveté de ces paroles, m'avoua d'abord, qu'après avoir découvert quantité de Préjugés (qu'elle reconnoissoit pour tels) elle ne se sentoit pas encore tout à fait guérie de leur pouvoir, ni de leur fréquents retours. C'est pourquoi elle me demanda mon opinion sur ce sujet par écrit, ce que je fis de la manière la plus succincte qu'il me fut possible, prenant pour mon texte une partie de ce même passage de Cicéron, car l'autre partie regarda plutôt la pratique, que la spéculation. Je fis voir donc à sa majesté, l'accroissement successif des Préjugés, dans toutes les démarches et degrés de notre vie; et lui prouvois, que tous les hommes du monde conspirent à depraver la raison de chaque individu, depuis sa naissance jusqu'à sa mort. J'ay dépeint en petit et d'après nature (de la manière la plus vive que j'ay pu) les divers préjugés qui se trouvent dans toutes les conditions, distinctions ou qualités; et je n'ay rien blâmé, que ce que chacun blâme dans les autres, quelque indulgence qu'ils ayent pour leurs propres erreurs. Mais si quelqu'un vouloit conclure, que je suis contre la Science, la Religion, ou le Gouvernement, à cause que j'ay censuré les Universités, l'Eglise et les Politiques il pourroit par la même raison prétendre, que je suis contre l'éducation des enfans, contre le commerce et toutes sortes de professions, contre la conversation ordinaire et la Société civile, puisqu'il n'y a aucune de ces choses dont on ne puisse particulièrement abuser, et ce sont ces abus seulement, que j'ay pris la liberté de condamner. Mais j'oublie à qui j'ay l'honneur d'écrire, quand je fais une si longue apologie. Je ne crains pas que les Préjugés de mes ennemis me puissent nuire auprès un jugement si éclairé que le votre: c'est pourquoi sans plus de cérémonie, je suis, avec toute l'ardeur de la vénération possible, Monseigneur, de votre Altesse le plus fidelle et le plus obéissant Serviteur Toland.²
Amsterdam, Dec. 28. 1709.

¹ 'Neither Parents or Nurse, or Schoolmaster, or Poet, or Playhouse depraves our Senses, nor can the Consent of the Multitude mislead them: but all sorts of Traps are laid to seduce our Understandings, either by those whom I just now mentioned, who when they receive us tender and ignorant, infect and bend us as they please; or else by that Pleasure which lies so deeply rooted in every one of our Senses, the pretended Follower of Good, but the real Mother of all Evils, corrupted by whose Allurements, we do not sufficiently distinguish those things that are good by Nature, because they want this Softness and Titillation'. (*De Leg.*, Lib. I; Toland's translation, in *Letters to Serena*, The Preface, §10.)

² Brit. Mus. Add. MSS. 4463, f. 7.

Surely this letter strikes a familiar note. The *Letters to Serena* (1704) contain in § 10 of the Preface the equivalent of the bulk of our letter from 'L'origine de la force des préjugés . . .' until 'la liberté de condamner'. It is amusing to compare the letter with the original and with Holbach's French translation because it reveals the incorrectness of Toland's French.¹ Yet Toland was as proud of his bad French as Coleridge was of his faulty 'esteseian' Greek. The letter is important, because our author declares the first letter to Serena to be the clue to all his writings, and the origin, force, and destruction of prejudices in all spheres of human activity to be the central theme of his life.

This is a variation of a general theme of 'enlightenment'. If Bayle said: 'Je prétends avoir une vocation légitime pour m'opposer aux progrès des superstitions, des visions et de la crédulité populaire', Toland replaces superstition by prejudice, because he himself had to suffer from prejudices against his alleged illegitimate birth, his unusual names Junius Janus and his Catholicism. First he tried a way of escape, changed his name into John and his religion into Protestantism. This could not alter the primary facts and his uncertain position resulting from it. He never attained a definite position in society. That is the chief reason for his uncertainty and his lack of moderation. At first fighting prejudices affecting his person, he then turned against prejudices in general, against superstition, the church, wicked priests, popery, and revealed religion, in short against anything not derived from, or claiming to be above, reason. He understands prejudice in its original meaning as 'pre-judicium', 'a judgment formed antecedently to knowledge'. In his view it comprises all kinds of judgment which do not arise from the use of reason, but have their origin outside it; either internally, in emotions, inclinations, temperament, disposition, early impressions, 'ignorance of things past, uncertainty of the present time, solicitous curiosity about what is to come, our precipitancy in judging, our inconsideration in assenting, and want of due suspension of judgment'; or externally, in the influence of society and of all those persons and institutions which try to educate us, like midwives, nurses, schools and universities. Habit, praised by Hume as the basis of our actions and of reasoning, is denounced by Toland as depraving reason. It persuades us to 'take a questionable proposition for an axiom, old wives' fables for moral certitude, and human imposture for divine revelation' (*Christianity not Mysteries*, p. 18). All this 'makes us not only be carried away by vulgar errors in our practice, to be misled by our senses as well as our appetites, and to take numberless falsities for demonstrated truths in

¹ One example must suffice. The *Letters* as well as Holbach's translation speak about 'the origin and force of prejudices, not from their physical, but their moral causes'. Our letter says just the contrary.

matters of speculation, but likewise to be unjust to the merit of others, to confound the innocent with the guilty, and generally to prefer the latter' (*Letters*, etc., p. 14). But man should be educated to a right use of his understanding and to give 'law to his own actions in a free and reasonable manner'. Autonomous reason fighting heteronomous prejudice goes a step farther by regarding prejudice as a principle wrongly dividing men. Reason gives truth or ἀλήθεια (in Parmenides' language), prejudice gives only opinion or δόξα. Prejudice is, so to speak, the *principium individuationis* in the sphere of the mind. Toland, in the role of a Newton or Parmenides of the world of religion, orders the chaotic variety of religions by saying: They are all the same, one natural religion, divided into many creeds by prejudice; reason unites, prejudice divides men. If Toland's struggle is doubtless justified, in this point he is mistaken. For there is a right way of variation as well as a wrong one. Just as light is divided by a prism into different colours, so religion could be understood to be separated into a variety of religions by the operation of a similar positive principle.

Was Toland merely the fighter against prejudice? His somewhat ridiculous, but amusing Epitaph, written in Latin as well as in an apparently unpublished English version, tells us how he wished to be valued:

Here Lyeth John Toland.
 Who born near Derry in Ireland
 Studyed young in Scotland and Holland
 Which, growing riper, he did also at Oxford,
 And having more than once seen Germany
 Spent his Age of Manhood in, and about London.
 He was an assertor of Liberty,
 A lover of all sorts of Learning,
 A speaker of Truth.
 But no man's follower, or dependant,
 Nor could frowns, or fortune bend him,
 To decline from the ways he had chosen.
 His spirit is join'd with his aethereal father
 From which it originally proceeded,
 His body yielding likewise to nature
 Is laid again in the lap of its Mother.
 But he's frequently to rise himself again,
 Yet never to be the same Toland more.
 Born the 30th of Novemb. 1674
 Dy'd the 11th March 1722.

If you would know more of him Search his Writings.¹

Did he, facing death, really speak the truth, or is Coleridge's remark here confirmed that 'There is a small chance of Truth at the goal where there is not a child-like Humility at the Starting-post'? Fighting others he forgot to fight his own prejudices of self-love and materialism. He, the man

¹ B.M. Add. MSS. 4295, f. 76.

without restraint and moral standards, the writer without style and the thinker without logical form, was unlimited in his self-esteem. When he, groundlessly, accused Spinoza of being possessed by an immoderate passion to found a sect, I am not sure that he did not read his own lack of modesty into Spinoza's great modesty, and whether Peter Browne's¹ accusation that he desired to be the author of a sect might not be well-founded. He dreamed of a new religion uniting all the old religions.

On the whole his fight was spoilt by exaggeration and weakness. He was and remained Janus: exaggerated fighter without, indolent peacemaker within.

IV

Toland's position in the context of his age may be illustrated by his relations with Shaftesbury, which receive new light from their unpublished correspondence. We must see their common ground, their common problems and ideals, as well as the fundamental diversity of their characters and work. Their common aim was a Protestant policy; they fought for a Protestant succession in England and for the Protestant principle that men should obey the decision of their own conscience. Both loved with equal ardour antiquity, and religious and political liberty, and tried to combine the contrary principles of Renaissance and Reformation, arriving, however, at very different results. Both are free-thinkers, belonging to the same stage in the movement of enlightenment and making the same distinction of esoteric and exoteric philosophy. Both follow the 'natural light', but the one interprets it as sense, especially as moral sense, the other as reason. Shaftesbury applies it chiefly to the sphere of ethics which he, like Bayle, wants to make autonomous and independent of theology, and Toland to the sphere of religion which he intends to reduce to its rational basis.

The first letter is undated but expresses probably the original very friendly undisturbed relations prior to 1698/99, before Shaftesbury's first retirement to Holland, and before Toland had published without his consent his *Inquiry concerning Virtue* whereat 'he was greatly chagrined . . . and immediately bought up the whole impression before many of the books were sold'.²

Sir,

Chelsey. Friday afternoon,

[Without date or address.]

I am just come hither from Surrey: and hearing you had done me the Favour to call here, was just sending to you when I receiv'd yours by the Penny Post.

¹ Peter Browne, Senior Fellow of Trinity College, in his Reply to *Christianity not Mysteries*; J. P. Erman, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de Sophie Charlotte* . . . Berlin, 1801, p. 198.

² 'A sketch of the Life of the Third Earl of Shaftesbury, by his Son, the Fourth Earl', in Benjamin Rand, *The Life, Unpublished Letters, etc., of Anthony, Earl of Shaftesbury*, London, 1900, p. xxiii.

I shall not stirr from hence till I have heard again from you and when I may have the happiness of seeing you and receiving in particular what you have to communicate from our good Lord whose commands I shoud gladly receive from any hands but from none so agreeably as from yours, being as I am so sincerely

Your obliged humble servant

Shaftesbury.¹

The second letter, more important in itself, written after Shaftesbury's first disappointment with Toland, has as its basis the common Protestant policy in which Toland seemed destined to play a part.

St. Giles's, July 21st.

I receiv'd yours with a great deal of satisfaction both in hearing so well of the Publick and of yourself and other Friends whome I esteem both on a publick and private account.

You are now in a great Scene of Affaires and Providence has assign'd you a great Part in them: since you meet (as I perceive you do) with so much Favour and Encouragement from Men of the greatest Worth and on whome the Interest of Europe depends.

I hope you will remember that as you are the more rais'd, you are the more bound to preserve a Character such as becomes a Man who supports the Cause of Religion, Liberty and Vertue, and that it is not only your own and a few Friends' Reputation that is hazzarded but that your Native Country and the Lovers of it as well as all those of right Principles whome you represent to persons abroad, all these are engag'd with you and their Fame and Reputation in the Protestant World and amongst that Free People where you are known, does in a great manner depend on your Behaviour.

This is enough to inspire any one with Resolutions of the most vertuose and strictest Conduct who is already inspir'd (as you have shewn yourself to be) with the Love of your Country and of the Cause of Liberty.

Other people may magnify your vertues to you and be still flattering you with the mention of your Abilites and of those natural and requir'd advantages which Providence has made yours. I who am your best and truest Friend (for so I know myself to be) will never cease, on the contrary, telling you of every Fault that I either find or fear, and as I endeavour in this manner to amend my Self without being partiall or sparing to my Self, so I shall do to you whilst you stand to me in that near relation to my Self, that of a Friend.

Your letter it was impossible for me to consent to send to the Duke of Newcastle because of things in it too advantageouse to myself, nor would I willingly appear so considerable as perhaps may be with some persons abroad: for by being less considerable at that account here at home I have been and may be able to do the more good.

But whatever Good I may be able to do, I for my part shall ever studdy to be as little considerable and known as possible. Be it Weakness or Defect in me; it is my Temper. My greatest Desire is Privacy and Retirement. I am not so well fitted to bear the World; and whatever good I may do Mankind it must still be in the same Private Character.

Farewell. Yours

Shaftesbury.

For Mr. Toland.

To be left at Mr. Benjamin Furly's Merchant in Rotterdam.²

¹ B.M. Add. MSS. 4295, f. 57. ² P.R.O., Shaftesbury Papers G. D. 24, bdl. XXI, f. 231.

The date of this letter can be exactly fixed, because Shaftesbury wrote on the same day, 21 July 1701, to Mr. Furly: 'I had a letter from Mr. Toland, to which I answer'd this post. I am sorry, but not surpriz'd, that he should not take his measures more justly, so as not to offend or disoblige my Lord Macclesfield in his present character and circumstances'.¹

Charles Gerard, second Earl of Macclesfield, was sent as Ambassador to the Court of Hanover in 1701, in order to convey the order of the Garter and congratulations on the establishment of the succession in favour of the Hanoverian family. He died soon after his return, 5 October 1701. Toland accompanied him, brought his *Anglia Libera* personally to the Electress Sophia of Hanover and remained longer, but for less than a year, as is proved by the following letter.

I beg the Favor of you to let my Lord Halifax know that I design to do my self the Honor of waiting on him to morrow-morning at his own House. I am sure I shall be much the wellcomer for your Lordship's Recommendation, and if by a penny post Letter (or otherwise) at the Grecian Coffehouse, you'll be pleas'd to inform me that you have thus pav'd my way, I shall think it a particular obligation, being prest in Time. I am, my Lord, your Lordship's most oblig'd and humble Servant

Jo. Toland.

March 10. 1702.

For the R.H. the Earl of Shaftesbury, to be left for him at the House of Lords. Westminster.²

This letter is preceded in the same volume of manuscripts³ by the following letter of Shaftesbury to Halifax: ⁴

My Lord,

I promised the person who sent this enclos'd to me, that I would present his Book to your Lordship and afterwards himself: but in this confusion of affaires I forgot both: so chose to send you this, as a less trouble to you than a visit on this account merely, from

Your faithfull humble Servant
Shaftesbury.

Tuesday afternoon.

Toland's next communication⁵ is marked by a frankness equal to that of Shaftesbury's last letter to him.

Oct. 22. 1705

My Lord,

The last time I had the honor to write to your Lordship, you were pleas'd to tell me, that my frank manner of placing a Confidence in your Lordship did

¹ *Original Letters of Locke, etc.*, ed. T. Forster, 1830, p. 146. Cf. Toland's *An Account of the Courts of Prussia and Hanover*, ed. 1714, pp. 58 ff., esp. 64, 65.

² B.M. Add. MSS. 7121, f. 61.

³ *Loc. cit.*, f. 59.

⁴ Charles Montagu, Earl of Halifax (1661-1715), had been Chancellor of the Exchequer since 1694, Auditor of the Exchequer since 1699, and a member of the House of Lords since 1701.

⁵ P.R.O., Shaftesbury Papers, G.D. 24, bdl. XX, 105.

not displease you: and in Return I presume to assure you, that your Lordship's frank manner for chideing me for real or imaginary faults, has not diminisht, but rather increast that Confidence. Therefore I beg your Lordship not to take notice to any man liveing that I am author of the Book I send you per bearer, and which I begun to write the next week after you came to Chelsea. Perhaps I may be nam'd among others by the Town, tho' my not sauntering any longer in Coffeehouses, nor keeping so much tattling Company as I formerly us'd, may probably keep me out of Remembrance on this Occasion. Yet if I should be guest, 'tis still but guessing, for the Printer himself knows no more of the author than the great Turk. By this memorial you may perceive what sort of Tory I am grown, and at the same time what sort of politicians they are at the Grecian, who (as I am inform'd by no mean person) report that I am become a Tory; when it is impossible for 'em to know any thing of a man that was perfectly retir'd in the Country, and that frequents no publick places in the Town. But I understand from another that the Ground for that spiteful Ly, was my getting Mr Lawton (who is ready to serve his friends of all opinions) to deliver the money I gave him for some of those scoundrel Currs, that were loos'd on me at once by certain unforgiveing managers, who, because notwithstanding all their Greatness they were easily run down themselves, thought for ever to oppress so little a fellow as I by so unworthy a Treatment, which has serv'd but to inspire me with Resolutions which without their provocations perhaps I had never entertain'd, tho never so capable.

But leaving this, as well as my own Justification against Immorality, till you are dispos'd to admit me to make my Apology; I shall only tell your Lordship, that it is really your fault, if this book be not so good as you wou'd have it, since my Design of Seeing you some weeks ago was to advise about it. However it has given full Satisfaction to him that encourag'd the work, and I hope after perusal your Lordship will be pleas'd to give your Opinion of it to, my Lord, your Lordship's most faithful, obliged and humble Servant

J. T.

I lodge at Mr Ridgley's in De la Haye Street. It has a door into the Park, by which any man may come to me incognito.

This letter, no doubt, accompanied the *Memorial of the State of England*, written, as we saw, for Harley probably after 26 June 1705; for on this date Toland offered his services to the government in a letter proposing to go to Germany 'neither as minister nor as spy' but as a kind of private monitor of the Minister, and to send a weekly correspondence to his Lordship. Harley, while not accepting this offer, made another proposition. Our letter is interesting in revealing again Janus's two faces, the open and the secret one, and the man whose house possessed both a main entrance and a backdoor. It speaks well for him that he reveals his secret face to his old benefactor, but the word 'immorality' had already been spoken, and Toland felt he had to apologize. What impression this confession made on Shaftesbury is easy to imagine if one knows how he judged Robert Harley, first Earl of Oxford (1661-1724), who had lost all reputation and trust among his Whig friends, and was looked on as 'one desperately engaged in

another party'.¹ That Toland's connection with Harley was the chief reason for the cooling down of their friendship is confirmed once more by the following letter.² The secrecy of Janus has grown still more. No date is given.

My lord,

The bearer knows not who this comes from, and so ther's no need of Superscription to your Note.

I shall say nothing of the Difference I conceive between your Lordship's Judgment and that of most others, nor of the better foundation on which I think your merit is built: but the great obligations with which you have so often loaded me, require me to make a confidence of that to you which I carefully conceal from all others. Gentlemen's Letters of Ceremony, and Schollar's Letters of Trifles, are things I never reliaht; and therefore you must not look on my Respect or Gratitude to be less, tho I never write, having in Reality nothing worth while to communicate. I am now in some manner altering my Circumstances: for what my Lord Somers' Ministry wou'd not give me, and what I wou'd not ask of my Lord Nottingham's Ministry, the present Ministry unsought has offer'd, and I am willing to accept. But on what Terms and to what Purposes, I shall let your Lordship understand if you please to appoint me an hour any time this day or to-morrow; but I would not have it known to your best friend, I don't mean my being there, but on what occasion. Being very busy myself, I sha'nt give you much Trouble; but 'tis absolutely necessary that I begin on clear ground, for I am fully resolv'd to end so. And haveing so good a voucher on occasion, I shall not in the meanwhile be solicitous what those think of me whose opinion I value less, or who ought not at all to be acquainted with such matters! I am, my Lord, your Lordship's most humble and most obedient Servant.

Jo. Toland.

To the right honourable the Earl of Shaftesbury,
at his house in Little Chelsea.

Since Nottingham retired in 1704 and Harley became Secretary of State on 18 May 1704, and since Toland had offered his services on 26 June 1705, this letter must have been written after this date and probably even after the preceding letter. For it begins with a reference to Shaftesbury's unfavourable opinion of the book, which indeed must have differed from other judgments of which Toland was so proud. About the interview itself, if it ever took place, history has nothing to say, but that it was impossible to become dependent on Harley, and to remain a friend of Shaftesbury follows from the simplest *logique du coeur*. This is the last letter we have. There is, however, not the slightest reason for blaming Toland, and fortunately we are able to reveal, to a certain extent, the nature of Harley's proposals. Elisha Smith writes in a letter to Thomas Hearne (London, 23 January 1706): 'The Oration he [Toland] is putting out (as I formerly told you of) is quite printed in Latin and almost finished likewise in

¹ *Original Letters of Locke*, etc., ed. T. Forster, 1830, p. 174.

² P.R.O., Shaftesbury Papers, G.D. 24, bdl. XXI, f. 237.

English; there you will see he has some skill in Latin. For this Edition and Service he has the promise of being made Keeper of the Paper Office that belongs to the Secretaries of State, a place of 400 £ per annum, it has been vacant this 4 years'.¹ This Oration is probably the *Oratio Philippica Ad excitandos contra Galliam Britannos* (first published in 1707; a second edition with the addition of *Gallus Aretalogus* appeared in 1709). Whether Toland refers to this offer in his letter is not certain, but the line of Harley's offers is clearly indicated.

Thus this correspondence between Toland and Shaftesbury, putting their personal relation to each other in the clearest light, reveals that the problems discussed between them, leading to a crisis and in all probability to an end of their friendship, were those of a Protestant policy in general and of practical policy in particular, and not those of philosophy and religion, of Antiquity and Renaissance. These, on the contrary, were common ground, undiscussed in these letters.

V

How far Toland's and Shaftesbury's political attitudes differed may be deduced from the following considerations. In the posthumous collections of Swift's poems appears one which, according to Deane Swift, was written by Swift in December 1711, 'occasioned by his friend the Lord Treasurer Oxford's hinting to him one evening that he wished a ballad made on the Earl of * * *'. This poem, addressed to Lord Nottingham, begins:

If dearest Dismal you for once will dine
Upon a single dish and tavern wine,
Toland to you this invitation sends
To eat the Calves Head with your trusty friends.

Deane Swift adds that when this poem was brought by the printers to that famous and grand society consisting of about sixteen of the greatest men of England (among them Swift), it made them all laugh a dozen times.² (Of this poem an unrecorded copy, not in Swift's handwriting, is in B.M. Add. MSS. 32683.³)

The question is, What does the poem reveal about Toland's relation to

¹ Bodl. Rawlinson MSS., C146, f. 47. The same letter contains many other interesting remarks upon Toland's paper on Livy, his attitude towards Christianity and religion and towards his own book *Christianity not Mysterious* which he regards as 'only his juvenile thoughts at 25'. 'I firmly believe him to be a Man of Religion and of the Faith of the Church of England. He intends to expose the Presbyterians if they will not send in their answer about Toleration.' Toland had sent a circular to all denominations asking their opinion about toleration.

² *Essay on the Life of Swift*, 1755, p. 227. Deane Swift adds: 'This we are told in a letter from Swift to Mrs. Johnson'. Cf. *Journal to Stella*, 17 July 1712, and Ford to Swift, 14 August 1714, and 16 November 1733. (*The Letters of Jonathan Swift to Charles Ford*, ed. D. Nichol Smith, Oxford, 1935.)

³ It is not mentioned in *The Poems of Jonathan Swift*, ed. H. Williams, Vol. I, p. 161, who gives all the material relating to this poem.

this Club? Would Swift have brought the accusation against him unless there was a grain of truth in the story?

Fortunately we possess *The Secret History of the Calves-Head Clubb, or, the Republican unmasqu'd: Wherein is fully shewn the religion of the Calves' Head Heroes, In their Anniversary Thanksgiving Songs on the Thirtieth of January, by them called Anthems; For the years 1693, 1694, 1695, 1696, 1697. Now Published, To demonstrate the Restless, Implacable Spirit of a certain Party still among us, who are never to be satisfied till the present Establishment in State and Church is subverted.* London 1703.¹

This pamphlet reveals the continuation of the Commonwealth republicanism after the restoration of the Monarchy. For the club was instituted to commemorate the anniversary of 'the execrable Regicide of King Charles the First'. But the most interesting point in this anti-republican and anti-revolutionary pamphlet is the author's story (based on the testimony of a friend) 'that Milton, and some other Creatures of the Commonwealth, had instituted this Clubb . . . in opposition to Dr. Juxon, Dr. Sanderson, Dr. Hammond, and other Divines of the Church of England'.²

If we suppose that Toland was a member of this Club, then his editing the works of Milton, his writing of the *Life of John Milton* (1698), and his publication of *Amyntor: or a Defence of Milton's Life* (1699) suddenly appear in a new light. For in these books he discusses all the facts and quotes at length from every one of Milton's publications relating to the death of Charles I. He agrees completely with Milton's pamphlet, published exactly a fortnight after the King's death and a week after the Republic had been declared, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates, proving that it is lawfull to call a Tyrant to account, and to depose or put him to death.* He agrees with him that people have the right to deliver themselves from the slavery of a tyrant by the surest and most effective methods. He declares Milton's *Defence of the People of England against Salmasius's Defence of the King* to be his 'Masterpiece, his chief and favorite work in Prose, for argument the noblest, as being the Defence of a whole free nation, the people of England; for stile and disposition the most eloquent and elaborate, equalling the old *Romans* in the purity of their own language, and their highest notions of liberty . . . and certain to endure while Oratory, Politics, or History bear any esteem among Men'. He praises Milton for having delivered the first of nations from the two arch-mischief of this life, and the most destructive of virtue, Tyranny and Superstition, and thus reveals the connection of his chief interest with Milton as the champion of freedom and free-thought and with the Calves' Head Club.

Of course, the political Janus also has two faces. Accused of being a Commonwealth man, he either affirms that there is not 'one single Com-

¹ Bodl. Godw. Pamphl. 1263.

² *Op. cit.*, p. 9.

JOHN

monv
Brita
as re
aristo
we se
mind
ism r
was
Milt
pract
the m
expr
inter
the
theo
Eng
by
pan
for

All
rest
if v
can
am
His
I
init
to
So
Hi
Ps
In

monwealth's-man, in the sense you understand it (*State Anatomy of Great Britain*, p. 8) or he confesses to its truth, if Commonwealth be understood as *res publica*, a free state which might have the form of democracy, aristocracy or monarchy (cf. Locke, *On Government*, II. X, § 133). Thus we see that Toland represents a stage in the development of the English mind, where not only Reformation and Renaissance, but also Republicanism meet. This republicanism, a living tradition in the Calves' Head Club, was derived from fact, not from theory, namely, from Cromwell's and Milton's republicanism. Therefore it was revolutionary in theory and practice, and revealed the real, the fighting face of *Janus politicus*, whereas the realities of life and the dependence on Harley forced him sometimes to express more conservative views. This revolutionary republicanism is internally connected with the break-up of the religious consciousness and the tendency towards a materialistic interpretation of life. Here the theorists of the French Revolution are anticipated, but only because the English Revolution and the English Commonwealth preceded the French by more than a hundred years. Seen from this point of view Janus's pantheism and materialism are probably not much more than a disguise for his revolutionary republicanism.

VI

All these letters and actions show Toland just as he was: a man with a restless mind delighted in motion *qua* motion, in action *qua* action. Even if we may doubt his moral integrity and the originality of his thought, we cannot doubt the explosive and disruptive energies of his nature, nor the amount of motion which he excited. His rehabilitation ought to start here. His importance is to excite and to transmit motion.

He acquires historical significance by transmitting the motive power initiated by Giordano Bruno. He made Bruno known in his time. He lent to friends a translation of two dialogues and of Bruno's *Asse*, i.e. of the *Sonetto in Lode de l'asino* (*Cabala del cavallo Pegaso*, ed. Lagarde, p. 564). His translation has, as old Mosheim would say, the *pestilentissimus* title *A Psalm before Sermon, in praise of Asinity* (*A Declamation, that is a Sermon, Inscrib'd to the studious, devout and pious Readers*). It begins thus:

O sacred Asinity! O sacred Folly!
 O sacred Ignorance! O pious Devotion!
 Which renders our souls so very wise and holy.
 As not t'improve by any human notion!
 Lean tedious watchings thou never dost enjoin,
 In Search of Arts, or any new Discovery;
 Nor thinkst *Philosophy* the proper ware or coin,
 To gain or forfeit *Heaven* the Recovery. . . .¹

¹ B.M. Add. MSS. 4295, f. 64.

He knew very well that Bruno meant by Asinity the attitude of mind forming the ideal of the church, and that his work was in ironical praise of the magnificent majesty of ignorance, learned foolishness and divine asinity. So enthusiastic was he about it that he produced a rather poor imitation: *A very pious Psalm after Sermon, about the meaning of the Asse and her Foal.*

Go to yon village that dos face us,
To's holy slaves, quath the Lord Jesus;
There a Shee-asse and foal you'll find,
Which you must seize and straight unbind. . . .¹

He sent the Baron Hohenheim a letter about Bruno's death, containing a translation of C. Schoppius's well-known report. He added further an account of Bruno's *Of the infinite Universe and innumerable Worlds*, or rather a translation of Bruno's dedicatory letter to the Lord Castelnau.

But the most important fact is that he found, and made known to friends and to a wider public through a letter and through translation, the *Spaccio della bestia trionfante*. An important letter of his has escaped the attention of modern scholars, *Lettre de Mr. Toland, sur le Spaccio della bestia trionfante*, Paris, 1584; in *Nova Bibliotheca Lubecensis*, Vol. VII, p. 158, Lubecae, 1756; cf. ib., p. 145: *Epistolæ aliquot ineditæ . . . de rarissimo Jiordani Bruni libro Spaccio della bestia trionfante exponentes* (the letter written in 1710 had been previously published by J. G. de Chauffepié in his *Supplement* to Bayle's *Dictionary*, 1750, Vol. I, p. 453²). Here he says about the book: 'il étoit entièrement inconnu aux curieux avant l'année 1696, que je le trouvai et le fis voir à différent personnes, quoique sans en laisser jamais prendre copie.'³ This date is of great importance for the study both of Toland and of Shaftesbury. For it makes it possible that *Christianity not Mysterior*, 1696, was written under the Italian's influence; and it furnishes an exact historical basis for the opinion that Shaftesbury wrote rather under the influence of Bruno, than under that of Spinoza (cf. W. Dilthey, *Ges. Schr.*, Vol. II, p. 521). The English translation of the book was made by William Morehead for Anthony Collins who had no intention of printing it. But it was removed from Collins's library by Toland, who had a few copies printed⁴ and sold them at a very high price. He understood quite well that the beast was not, as Schoppius, Bayle, and Leibniz assumed, the Pope, but every kind of revealed religion which triumphs in any way in this world; 'soit la religion

¹ *Loc. cit.* 4295, f. 65.

² *Nouveau Dictionnaire Historique et Critique*, etc., Amsterdam, 1750.

³ *Nova Bibliotheca Lubecensis*, Vol. VII, p. 158.

⁴ These facts are noted in pencil in J. Martineau's copy of this very rare translation. They are in harmony with Mosheim's account and unfortunately with Toland's character. Cf. also Halkett and Laing—*Dictionary of Anonymous and Pseudonymous English Literature*, New ed., 1926.

païenne, soit la judaïque, soit la chrétienne; il les attaque, les tourne en ridicule, et les rejette également sans aucune cérémonie et sans exception'. He identifies himself with Bruno: 'Je souhaite que les hommes dégagés de tout préjugé en faveur de l'une ou de l'autre, ou de quelque religion que ce soit, voulussent n'admettre d'autre règle de leur conduite, que la loi ou la religion naturelle, qu'il divise en quarante huit articles selon le nombre des constellations du ciel, dont chacune . . . porte le nom d'une vertu . . .' (*Nova Biblioth.*, l.c., p. 159). That implies his acceptance of Bruno's religious or rather anti-religious attitude.

I cannot enter here into a detailed analysis of Bruno's influence on Toland.¹ It was very considerable and grew with the years. That Toland's pantheism is derived from Bruno and not from Spinoza, whom he criticized, is testified by his *Pantheisticon* (1720). This amusing performance, a mixture of serious thought and raillery, is important more for what it does than for what it says. I shall return later to its leading ideas. Though Greek and Latin sources are much in evidence (from Anaxagoras, Hippocrates, Socrates, to Cicero, Lucretius, Ammianus Marcellinus, etc.) Bruno's thought forms the central principle of this vast material. That the Universe (of which this world we behold with our eyes is but a small portion) is infinite both in extension and virtue, but one in the continuation of the whole and the contingency of the parts, eternal in existence and duration, intelligible by an eminent reason, filled with perfect order, unfinished, obedient to the law of the *coincidentia oppositorum*, God indwelling it as the Soul of the world; all that is pure Bruno. But practically this book contains a new kind of natural religion, restricted to a sect of Pantheists or a Socratic Society, based on some metaphysical principles and on a ritual which is a persiflage of the Roman Catholic cult. This clearly marks the transition from the first to the second stage in the great movement of 'the Enlightenment'. Select groups assume now the rôle of individuals. We may take it as a historical statement: 'There are, undoubtedly, in several places', namely in Paris, Venice, Rome, Amsterdam and chiefly London, 'not a few pantheists, who, according to the customs of others, have their private assemblies and societies, where they feast together, and what is the sweetest kind of sauce, where they philosophize over it' (*op. cit.* English translation, 1751, p. 110). These groups of pantheists correspond to, but are not identical with, the Lodge of the Freemasons which was founded about the same time, 1717, in London. They must be compared with the third stage when Voltaire asserted that there are more than a million Deists in Europe² and when he rejected all kind of sects and any kind of religion based on metaphysical opinion and rites. His Deist speaks a

¹ See J. F. Nourrisson, *Philosophies de la nature. Bacon, Boyle, Toland, Buffon*. Paris, 1887, pp. 85 ff.

² *Pièces détachées*, Vol. II, p. 94.

language understood by all, and despises closed doors. His religion consists in adoration and justice. 'Faire le bien, voilà son culte; être soumis à Dieu, voilà sa Doctrine.'¹

But Toland founded a sect, introduced a ritual, based it on metaphysics, and closed it to the mass of people; in short he created what he himself had called a mystery (*Christianity not Mysterious*, pp. 67 ff.).

VII

There is no room here for discussing Toland's relations either with Leibniz,² or with Pierre Bayle,³ or his influence on Voltaire, which seems to have been rather superficial.⁴ Nor can I go into an analysis of his spiritual development. It must suffice to say that he anticipates the dissolution of the religious consciousness in Europe. He began as a Catholic, but he became a Protestant before he was sixteen; a Latitudinarian in Holland under the influence of Spanheim and of Arminians like Clericus, a Socinian (for a time a friend of Firmin); then an adherent of 'natural religion or a Deist, and, under Bruno's influence, a Pantheist, almost rejecting Christianity. He went even further by embracing materialism pure and simple, and by professing a kind of dynamic materialism, a pan-dynamism ('all is motion') and a pan-materialism ('all is matter'). This dynamic materialism is a forerunner of Marx's dialectical materialism, but with this fundamental difference that Toland's dynamic principle has its origin in nature, whereas in Marx it emanates from man and history.

But is Toland important only because he anticipated developments which took centuries to work out? Has his life merely a representative value? Was he not more than an ever-changing mind? Is there no substance of lasting value in his work which might fix his rank among European philosophers? There is; and the axiomatic method⁵ enables us to ascertain it by formulating the following propositions.

1. *Reason is the true and first law, the life and splendour of life.*⁶ This first axiom, derived from Descartes's *Cogito, ergo sum*, expresses the specifically modern attitude⁶ and the principle of Enlightenment. Descartes could agree to defining reason as 'that faculty of the soul which discovers the certainty of anything dubious or obscure, by comparing it with something

¹ *Pièces détachées*, Vol. I, p. 449.

² They form the subject of a special study which I hope to publish elsewhere.

³ Cf. L. P. Courtines, *Bayle's Relations with England and the English*. New York, 1938; especially pp. 148 ff.

⁴ N. L. Torrey, *Voltaire and the English Deists*. Yale, 1930.

⁵ I hope to deal elsewhere with this method. It consists, to put it into a nutshell, in writing philosophies in axiomatic language. It provides an exact basis for comparing and analysing philosophies and transforms history of philosophy into science. It is this method which I applied in my pamphlet, *David Hume, The Man and his Science of Man*, Paris, 1940.

⁶ *Pentheisticon*, p. 73.

evident
definit
of idea
differen
harmon

Toland
thinkin
Under
tion w
it, and
Eviden
duty to
think
critica
theolo
tion, a

Wh
accept
of tru
fore I
differ
Shaft
natur
repr
of the
unde
ness
of T
He s
comp
must
whet
'reas
scien
and

T
late
Hur
of th

1
2
3
Thin

evidently known'.¹ Toland accepts, however, at the same time Locke's definition of reason as 'the perception of the agreement and disagreement of ideas'.² Locke followed a similar principle, but interpreted it rather differently. The *lumen naturale* and the *lumen supranaturale* are in apparent harmony in Locke's doctrine, in open disharmony in Toland's thought.

Toland's belief in reason is absolute. He takes it as a means of free-thinking, the latter defined in the terms of Collins as 'The Use of the Understanding, in endeavouring to find out the meaning of any Proposition whatsoever, in considering the nature of the Evidence for or against it, and in judging of it according to the seeming Force or Weakness of the Evidence'. He is at one with this author in his conviction 'that it is our duty to think freely on those points on which men are deny'd the right to think freely'; that is, on questions of religion.³ Locke applied the same critical principle to metaphysics which Toland applied to religion and theology. Yet Toland's radicalism contrasts sharply with Locke's moderation, and extends to all spheres of human life including politics.

Whereas Locke chooses sound reasoning as man's guide, Toland accepts human reason as the measure of all things, of being and not being, of truth and falsehood, of good and evil. His first principle implies therefore Protagoras's *dictum*, 'Man is the measure of all things'. But it has a different basis, namely the belief in the perfect nature of man. Just as Shaftesbury believes in the natural moral perfection of man guided by a natural moral sense and as Leibniz believes in the monad as a perfect representation of the best of all worlds, Toland believes in the perfection of the finite understanding and takes it as if it were infinite. This reason is understood as infallible, in distinction from Bayle who stresses the feebleness of our understanding, but in accordance with William Lyons, author of *The Infallibility of Human Judgment, its Dignity and Excellency* (1713). He surely would agree with Lyons's statement, that reason is not only a competent and infallible judge, but the only test by which all authorities must submit to be tried, before we can know ourselves, or prove to others, whether they are good or bad. But he is more precise in the use of the word 'reason' than Lyons, for whom judgment, reason, light of nature, conscience, emanation of light from above, Ray of the Divinity, Image of God, and Spirit of Truth are equivalent.

This thesis is best understood if compared with its antithesis as formulated by John Norris, that human reason is not the measure of truth. Human understanding is finite; it is able to grasp only a limited number of the infinite relations in which each being stands. In this point Leibniz,

¹ *Christianity not Mysterious*, p. 14.

² *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³ *A Discourse of Free-Thinking, Occasion'd by the Rise and Growth of a Sect call'd Free-Thinkers*. 1713, pp. 5 ff.

Malebranche, Norris, and Kant are right. Only an *intellectus infinitus*, able to comprehend in one act all possible aspects and all the implications of a fact, could be the measure of truth. Toland errs in mistaking the *intellectus finitus* for an *intellectus infinitus*. The former cannot be the measure of the latter, but the infinite understanding (whether reality or fiction) must be the measure of the finite understanding.

So far from being abstract and artificial, this problem is essentially concrete and even central for our present age. Toland formulates one general principle of the French and Russian Revolutions. For the French Revolution tried to realize the realm of reason; just so to-day reason undertakes to plan the whole life of society, from economy to art and religion. But what is wrong with that? Should not reason govern human society? Surely it should. Yet there is finite reason and infinite reason. Human reason, aware of its limitations, and bowed in reverence for the incredible variety of reality not created by it and for the values representing a degree of perfection denied to human beings, is an excellent guide. But reason, losing all modesty and sense of proportion, arrogantly parading itself as infallible and omniscient, i.e. as divine, leads of necessity to catastrophe. For it is unable to fulfil these great expectations.

Toland's radicalism is theoretically revolutionary, and became practically revolutionary by reaching the masses. In England the Blasphemy Act (1697-8) prevented this. The English Enlightenment remains aristocratic and select. And Janus develops two philosophies, one esoteric, internal, naked, entire, unmasked, conforming to the nature of things, revealed 'in the recesses of a private chamber, to men only of consummate probity and prudence'; the other adjusted to the prejudices of the people or to doctrines publicly authorized as true.¹

He tries to justify this lamentable division on the authority of Parmenides who distinguished two sorts of philosophy, the one according to truth, the other according to opinion. He even maintains that the distinction between an esoteric and exoteric philosophy was common through the ages. In this case he has no compunction in giving way to prejudice.

Nevertheless his first axiom implies that everything outside reason is mere prejudice and superstition and therefore wrong. Human reason acknowledges as real only relations conformable to it; therefore he is convinced that neither confusion, nor fortune, nor chance are the makers of the universe; that no vacuum exists, and that the most perfect order regulates all things.²

From this it follows, that because there is only *one* reason in all human beings, there is only *one* religion, *one* moral law, and *one* universe. In other

¹ *Clidophorus, or of the Exoteric and Esoteric Philosophy*, 1720.

² *Pantheisticon*, pp. 10-16.

JOHN

words
he enu2. 'A
world
is imm
whole,
chang
person3. 'A
extens
for Le
univers
of rea
motio
things
innovTo
this t
lectur
ideas
ing th
phen
Moti
infini
vario
does
sible
Anax4. 'A
(coin
Brun
of o
ever
chan
tion
than
A
than5. 'A
is ne
by r1
10

words Toland's pantheism is a consequence of his rationalism. Therefore he enunciates this second axiom:

2. '*All things in the world are one, and one is All in all things*'.¹ Only one world and one universe, comprising infinite worlds, exist. The universe is immovable according to the whole, movable according to the parts. The whole, as well as the parts, is always the same. Only the arrangement changes. This is the well-known pantheistic thesis, which takes a more personal character in the next axiom.

3. *The Universe is essentially Intellect and Motion*; and not intellect and extension, as for Descartes and Spinoza, or representation and motion, as for Leibniz. The universe as mind is God. He, the creator and ruler of the universe is its soul, 'not separated from the Universe, but by a distinction of reason only'. He is, on the other hand, infinite action. All particular motions mutually terminate, restrain, retard, or accelerate themselves. All things are in motion; diversities are names for particular motions. No real innovation occurs, except the sole permutation of place.

Toland might have claimed a certain originality if he had elaborated this thesis. But *Janus secretissimus* claims to have proved in his esoteric lectures that 'thought is a peculiar motion of the brain' and that 'all our ideas are corporeal'.² He does not make any use of the intellect for explaining the universe. Matter is to him the only reality, thought a mere epiphenomenon. Therefore his real doctrine is: *The Universe is Matter and Motion*. All things are compounded of simple, actually indivisible elements, infinite in number and species, through composition, separation and various mixture; but with proper measures, weight and motions. Yet he does not reduce organic to inorganic matter. On the contrary, his indivisible elements are 'seeds', identical in both realms, the *Homæomeres* of Anaxagoras. Everything on earth and in the universe is organic.

4. *The change in the universe is governed by the coincidence of extremes (coincidentia oppositorum)*. This law, formulated by Cusanus and Giordano Bruno, is interpreted in a peculiar manner. It announces that every particle of our globe must undergo all sorts of adventures and vicissitudes; that every region may gradually partake in all aspects of the sun, and that sea changes into land and *vice versa*. This he calls the doctrine of the revolution of all things; it contains more truth when applied to human affairs than to the universe.

As for man, freedom is his highest good. 'It is better to rule over none, than to be any man's slave.'³ Therefore the last axiom is:

5. '*Freedom consists in following reason, that is the law of nature*'. Freedom is not identical with libertinism. The free man does not accept laws framed by men, for they are neither clear, nor universal, nor always the same, nor

¹ *Pantheisticon*, p. 16.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 22, 24.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 83.

even efficacious. But he voluntarily agrees to be brought up and to be governed by the law of nature, because this is identical with his own reason. Freedom is here, as later in Kant, identical with autonomy. But whereas Kant makes great efforts to formulate the moral law, Toland contents himself with quoting Cicero's dictum about the one law of nature, identical for all nations.

Thus Toland's last principle is freedom; free-thought as identical with free action. In this he represents one specifically English aspect of the period of Enlightenment. In England the 'light of nature' is used for the liberation of thought and action. Free-thought, freedom of speech, freedom of action, and, last but not least, free trade found their championship in this country. Toland is important not as an original thinker, but as focussing and transforming the ideas of the past and presenting them in such a manner that they became in their fusion a pivot for one period of European history and had an enormously stimulating effect. In his short life he anticipated trends of thought which took centuries to develop. Therefore the representative value of his life far transcends the achievements of his moral and intellectual efforts. We must allow him to be seen from a standpoint beyond good and evil, beyond the battle of parties and sects, of tribes and nations. Then he, a great European, appears astonishingly modern. Then his invective against tyranny and prejudice sounds as though it were spoken not yesterday, nor to-day, but to-morrow.

SOME NOTES ON WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR

BY E. K. CHAMBERS

In November 1808 Landor wrote to Southey:

But, Southey, I love a woman who will never love me, and am beloved by one who never ought.¹

Mr. Malcolm Elwin quotes this letter, and adds, in comment,

It seems simply that Landor referred only to Ianthe in his statement to Southey. He could not tell the virtuous Southey bluntly that his unhappiness arose from his failure to persuade a married woman to leave her husband, so he disguised the fact in a half-truth. He loved Ianthe, who would not love him well enough to give up for him her husband, home, and reputation, though she was prepared to go on loving him as an unfaithful wife.²

I find this explanation simply incredible. No doubt the first woman of the letter was Ianthe. But the second has not been identified. Landor, during his life at Bath and elsewhere, after his father's death in 1805, had various flirtations, which alarmed his sister Elizabeth, before he met Julia Thuillier in 1811³; but these do not explain the 'never ought' of the letter. What Elizabeth feared was an improvident marriage. I do not know who the second woman was. But there is just one possibility that may be worth consideration. Sending some verses to Mrs. Graves-Sawle in January 1856, Landor wrote:

Those to a Lady at Malvern I found accidentally as I was about to burn a packet of letters. I felt great pity, no great love for this lady, long since dead. On the other side are a few verses on our old friend Barry's marriage.⁴

Wheeler does not here print the Malvern verses, although he does those on Barry. But I think they may be safely identified with the following, which he put next to the Barry ones, in his edition of Landor's *Poems* for the Clarendon Press.⁵ Both pieces were printed, by Landor himself, shortly after his letter of 1856, in *Dry Sticks* (1858).

¹ J. Forster, *Walter Savage Landor. A Biography*, ed. of 1869, i. 238.

² *Savage Landor* (1941), 116.

³ Forster, i. 201-3; Elwin, 118.

⁴ S. Wheeler, *Letters of W.S.L. Private and Public* (1899), 197.

⁵ 1937, iii. 55.

OCTOBER 1799

Why should sorrow darken over
 Brow by nature so serene?
 Come, those lucid gems uncover,
 Drop those fingers from between.

Sadness is my doom as often
 As a sigh escapes from you.
 Let me strengthen, and not soften,
 Heart so tender and so true.

It hath spoken: why confess it?
 Those loud sobs have told me thrice.
 I would only not possess it,
 O my love! at such a price.

There is no mention of Malvern here. There is, however, in the following lines,¹ which appeared in *The Examiner* for 17 November 1855, and are said (Elwin, 424) to have been found among Elizabeth Landor's papers, after her death on 24 February 1854.

WRITTEN AT MALVERN, JUNE 1799

Ye springs of Malvern, fresh and bright,
 Wherein the Spirits of health delight
 To dip incessantly their wings!
 Rise and sustain the pallid maid
 Who steps so slow and seeks your aid;
 Bless, and in turn be blest, ye springs!

If I might ask the Powers above
 One gift, that gift should be her love.
 Hush! thou unworthy creature, hush!
 Wouldst thou not rather see her, then,
 Without her love, in health agen?
 I pause; I bow my head, and blush.

With these are linked in tone, and in one case by a reference to Malvern in the title, two other pieces² which were printed in *Simonidea* (1806), and again in *Gebir, Count Julian and Other Poems* (1831), where they appear under the heading, *Ianthe*. This heading must not be taken too seriously. It is, I think, a matter of general agreement that, as Wheeler (iii. 105) says, Landor 'sometimes indited verses to one lady which he afterwards thought fit, with or without emendation, to offer to another'. Certainly we do not know that Ianthe, whom Landor probably did not meet before about 1803, ever sought to restore health, like the 'pallid maid' of June 1799, with the help of Malvern waters. Wheeler gives the first *Simonidea* poem no title.

¹ *Poems*, iii. 196.² *Poems*, iii. 105, 106.

She leads in solitude her youthful hours,
 Her nights are restlessness, her days are pain,
 O when will Health and Pleasure come again,
 Adorn her brow, and strew her path, with flowers;
 And wandering Wit relume the roseate bowers,
 And turn and trifle with his festive train!
 Grant me, O grant this wish, ye heavenly powers,
 All other gifts, all other hopes, restrain.

Here is the second:

WRITTEN AT MALVERN

Come back, ye Smiles, that late forsook
 Each breezy path and ferny nook.
 Come Laughter, though the sage hath said
 Thou favor'st most the thoughtless head:
 I blame thee not, howe'er inclin'd
 To love the vacant easy mind:
 But now am ready, may it please,
 That mine be vacant and at ease.
 Sweet children of celestial breed,
 Though much invoked, repress your speed.
 Laughter, though Momus gave thee birth,
 And said—'my darling, stay on earth'.
 Smiles, though from Venus you arise,
 And live for ever in the skies,
 I order that not one descend
 But first alights upon my friend.
 When one upon her cheek appears,
 A thousand spring to life from hers.
 Death smites his disappointed urn,
 And beauty, health, and joy, return.

Probably one ought to add the following¹ which was first printed in Wheeler's *Letters and Other Unpublished Writings of W.S.L.* (1897), and there dated in 1801.

THE FEARFUL

I would not see thee weep, but there are hours
 When smiles may be less beautiful than tears,
 Some of those smiles, some of those tears were ours;
 Ah! why should either now give place to fears?

I am more doubtful about one other piece² from *Poetry by the Author of Gebir* (printed 1800, published 1802).

¹ *Poems*, iii. 74.

² *Ibid.*, iii. 1.

TO NEÆRA

i

Thank heaven, Neæra, once again
 Our hands and ardent lips shall meet,
 And Pleasure, to assert his reign,
 Scatter ten thousand kisses sweet:
 Then cease repeating, while you mourn,
 'I wonder when he will return'.

ii

Ah, wherefor should you so admire
 The flowing words that fill my song,
 Why call them artless, yet require
 'Some promiss from that tuneful tongue?'
 I doubt if heaven itself could part
 A tuneful tongue and tender heart.

In Landor's *Collected Works* (1846) 'Ianthé' is substituted for 'Neæra'. But in a manuscript list of poems to Ianthe, he wrote 'cancel the whole of *Thank Heaven*'. With this exception, the tone of all the verses here given seems fairly consistent with Landor's statement in 1856 that he felt 'great pity, no great love' for the Lady at Malvern. We do not know whether she was married or not, but it is possible, I think, that her ill health might itself account for the 'never ought' in Landor's letter of 1808 to Southey. It must be admitted, of course, that there is a considerable span of years between 1799, or even 1801, and 1808.

Elwin's book is valuable. He was able to draw upon material which was not known to, or was suppressed by, John Forster in 1869. But it has its lapses. We are told (p. 128) that when the Llanthony estate brought some disillusion in 1811,

The signs of his frayed temper appeared in his abuse to Southey of the presence of 'nightingales and glowworms in my valley'. He always abominated nightingales as disturbers of his sleep.

So, too, after the citation of a retrospective account of Landor's lodgings in Bath during 1804-5, we get the comment (p. 83),

Nightingales annoyed him by waking him at night; years later in Italy when he read Byron's *Bride of Abydos* and came upon the lines, 'Know ye the land &c., where the citron and olive are fairest of fruit, And the voice of the nightingale never is mute', he exclaimed, 'who indeed does know where the nightingale never is mute?'

The reference to Byron would only have been relevant here, if that poet had written, not 'never is mute', but 'ever is mute'. Elwin has, of course, completely misunderstood what Landor wrote to Southey from Llan-

thony.¹ He complained of the uncomfortable conditions under which he had to live, but added,

I have made a discovery, which is, that there are both nightingales and glow-worms in my valley. I would give two or three thousand pounds less for a place that was without them.

'Two or three thousand pounds less', not 'two or three thousand pounds more', as Elwin's gloss requires. Nor did Landor complain of being kept awake by nightingales at Bath. All he says is:

The South Parade was always my residence in winter. Towards spring I removed into Pulteney-street—or rather towards summer; for there were formerly as many nightingales in the garden, and along the river opposite the South Parade, as ever there were in the bowers of Schiraz.²

In fact Landor adored nightingales. From his villa Gherardesca he wrote in 1830³:

Julia amuses herself with her fantail pigeons, her blackbirds, and nightingales. I could not prevent the nests being taken. Three were taken before—of nightingales—which grieved me. Upon this she employed some boys to take the fourth nest for her. I never took one in my life, though I have found many.

And again,

The children are just now very busy in catching grasshoppers for three young nightingales. Nevertheless the three young nightingales like me best, and fly to me over the back of the *cane lupe*, who growls and takes it ill.

In the *Pentameron*, Boccaccio says to Petrarca:

The nightingale is a lively bird to the young and joyous, a melancholy one to the declining and pensive. He has notes for every ear; he has feelings for every bosom; and he exercises over gentle souls a wider and more welcome dominion than any other creature. . . . I may venture to remark on the nightingale, that our Italy is the only country where this bird is killed for the market. In no other is the race of Avarice and Gluttony so hard run. What a triumph for a Florentine, to hold under his fork the most delightful being in all animated nature! the being to which every poet, or nearly every one, dedicates the first fruits of his labours. A cannibal who devours his enemy, through intolerable hunger, or, what he holds as the measure of justice, and of righteousness, revenge, may be viewed with less abhorrence than the heartless gormandiser, who casts upon his loaded stomach the little breast that has poured delight on thousands.

Finally, it is the nightingale who figures in the crowning insult of Landor's lines on *Malvolio*:

Thou hast been very tender to the Moon,
Malvolio! and on many a daffodil
And many a daisy hast thou yearn'd, until
The nether jaw quivered with thy good heart.
But tell me now, Malvolio, tell me true,

¹ Forster, i. 326.

² Forster, i. 334.

³ Forster, ii. 228-9.

Hast thou not sometimes driven from their play
 The village children, when they came too near
 Thy study, if hit ball rais'd shouts around,
 Or if delusive trap shook off thy Muse,
 Pregnant with wonders for another age?
 Hast thou sat still and patient (tho' sore prest
 Hearthward to stoop and warm thy blue-naild hand)
 Lest thou shouldst frighten from a frosty fare
 The speckled thrush, raising his bill aloft
 To swallow the red berry on the ash
 By thy white window, three short paces off?
 If *this* thou hast not done, and hast done *that*,
 I do exile thee from the Moon twelve whole
 Calendar months, debarring thee from use
 Of rose—bud, blossom, odour, simily—
 And furthermore I do hereby pronounce
 Divorce between the nightingale and thee.¹

I have given the poem in full, because, although many writers have described the quarrel between Landor and Wordsworth, I do not think it has been noted that Wordsworth is Malvolio. In confirmation I may quote a letter of about 1843² in which Landor wrote,

Wordsworth is a strange mixture of sheep and wolf, with one eye on a daffodil and the other on a canal-share.

One other confusion must be cleared up, as far as possible. Elwin (p. 44) writes,

In the verses called 'St. Clair', dated 5th October 1796, he describes his first meeting with Rose Aylmer—how, on seeing her, he found 'my courage, voice, and memory gone', and after his walk by her side,

When all but lovers long had slept,
 I tost and tumbled, fretted, wept,
 To Love himself vow'd endless hate,
 Renounced my stars and curst my fate.

But *St. Clair*³ has nothing to do with Rose Aylmer. Landor sent it to Mrs. Paynter in November 1857 and printed it in *Dry Sticks* (1858). To Mrs. Paynter he wrote (Wheeler, *Letters of W.S.L., Private and Public*, 207),

I send you a curiosity. Charlotte Phillippa gave me a lump of some mineral, which was afterwards stolen from me, and I wrote these lines at St. Clair's.

In a second letter, during the same month,⁴ he added,

Few are living who have written verses sixty-one years ago, and this is the sixty-first anniversary of mine.

St. Clair is St. Clear's in Carmarthen, between Tenby and Swansea, but a good deal nearer Tenby, of the two. I think that Elwin may have misunderstood Forster (i. 79), who wrote about *Gebir*:

¹ 1837 (*Poems*, iii. 237).

³ *Poems*, iii. 197.

² Elwin, 328.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 208.

The accident which led him to the subject selected I have often heard him relate. He was on friendly terms with the family of Lord Aylmer, who were staying in the neighbourhood, and one of the young ladies lent him a book, by a now-forgotten writer of romances, from the Swansea circulating library. Clara Reeve was the author. . . . He found it to be a history of romance having no kind of interest for him until he came at its close to the description of an Arabian tale. This arrested his fancy, and yielded him the germ of *Gebir*. More than sixty years later he wrote to me from Bath (30th Nov. 1857) that he had just discovered and sent to a lady living near him, also of that Aylmer family, a little poem called *St. Clair*, written all those years ago for her who thus lent him the book.

I do not know who Charlotte Phillips was, but presumably Mrs. Paynter and Forster did. She may have been related to the Aylmers. I have a suspicion that she may have become the Lady at Malvern. The *St. Clair* lines made their reappearance not long after those of October 1799 to that lady, and may well have come from the same packet of letters.

The loan of Clara Reeve's *The Progress of Romance* (1785), in which Landor found the story of Charoba, which he used for *Gebir*, must have taken place in 1794. In the preface to the edition of 1798 he records,¹ 'On the shelf of a circulating library, I met with a Critique on the various Novels of our Country', which gave it him. In that to the reissue of 1831² he says,

Gebir was written in my twentieth year. Many parts were first composed in Latin; and I doubted in which language to complete it. I had lost the manuscript: finding it four years after in a box of letters, I reduced it nearly to half, inserting a few verses in some places to give it its proportions.

This is in part confirmed by the *Apology for Gebir*:

Sixty the years since *Fidler* bore
My grouse bag up the Bala moor,
Above the lake, along the lea
Where gleams the darkly yellow Dee.
Thro' crags, o'er cliffs, I carried there
My verses with parental care,
But left them, and went home again
To wing the birds upon the plain.
With heavier luggage half-forgot,
For many months they followed not.
When over Tawey's sands they came,
Brighter flew up my winter flame,
And each old cricket sang alert
With joy that they had come unhurt.³

Abertaw is the Welsh name for Swansea which stands by the river Tawey. Rose Aylmer can have had nothing to do with the initiation of *Gebir*, or with *St. Clair*. It is unlikely that Landor ever met her, before about 1797 or 1798, at Swansea, whence they walked to Briton Ferry,

¹ *Poems*, i. 473.

² *Ibid.* i. 474.

³ 1854 (*Poems*, ii. 469).

hard by, but far from St. Clear's. Again I fall back on Landor's correspondence with Mrs. Paynter. In February 1853 he wrote to her of Rose:

After beating my brains, I picked up the only lines I wrote about her, until I heard, two years later, of her death . . . I will transcribe them.¹

Here are the lines²:

Where all must love, but one can win the prize,
The others walk away with tears and sighs.
With tears and sighs let them walk off, while I
Walk for three miles in better company.

Rose Aylmer went to Calcutta in 1798, and died on 2 March 1800.

¹ Wheeler, *Letters and Unpublished Writings of W.S.L.* (1897).

² *Poems*, iii. 98.

The
rece
Auth
out'
men
Dict
and
161
thes
'stra
In
divi
Tyr
ord
was
bish
bei
and
I
his
v
h
8
Ty
Lij
S.
D.
PP
N

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

'STRAIN AT A GNAT'

The author of a modern American version of the New Testament has recently revived the contention that the rendering 'strain at' in the Authorized Version of the Bible (Matt. xxiii, 24) is a misprint for 'strain out' of the earlier English versions; even claiming the impromptu agreement of Sir William Craigie, one of the editors of the *Oxford English Dictionary*.¹ *O.E.D.* s.v. *strain*, 14c and 21, had rightly rejected that view; and by two quotations of 1583 and 1594 showed 'that the translators of 1611 simply adopted a rendering that had already obtained currency'. Yet these quotations from Robert Greene and John King hardly explain why 'strain at' was adopted in the Authorized Version.

In 1570 the Latin Commentary on St. Matthew by the continental divine, Augustine Marlorate² was translated into English by Thomas Tymme.³ The English translation 'Sene and allowed according to the order appointed' had a wide circulation among English theologians and was licensed and recommended by Archbishop Parker and other English bishops.⁴ Marlorate's Commentary was strictly a 'Catholike exposition', being a collection of the expositions by great theologians on each chapter and verse of the Gospel.

For the passage in question Marlorate refers⁵ to Calvin's exposition in his *Harmonia*:⁶

. . . Ergo perinde faciunt, ac si quis tenuem panis micam colaret, integrum voraret panem. Culicem scimus pusillum esse animal: camelum ingentem belluam, nihil ergo magis ridiculum quam vinum vel aquam colare, ne culicem glutiendo fauces laedas, secure vero sorbere camelum . . .

Tymme's English rendering has:⁷

. . . They do therefore euen as if a man shoulde straine at a small crumme of bread, and swallow a whole loafe. Wee knowe that a gnat is a small creature,

¹ Edgar J. Goodspeed, 'The Misprint That Made Good', reprinted from *Religion in Life* (Spring 1943 issue).

² Augustinus Marloratus, *Novi Testamenti catholica expositio Ecclesiastica*, 1561.

³ Thomas Tymme, *A Catholike And Ecclesiasticall exposition of the holy Gospell after S. Mathewe . . . Augustine Marlorate . . .*, London, 1570. On Thomas Tymme see *D.N.B.*

⁴ Cf. John Strype, *The Life and Acts of Matthew Parker . . .* (Oxford, 1821), vol. ii, pp. 81-2; *ibid.*, the letter of Edwin Sandys, Bishop of London, to Parkhurst, Bishop of Norwich, 28 November 1571.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 193.

⁶ Calvin, *Harmonia Ex tribus Euangelistis Composita . . .*, 1563, p. 526.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, fol. 538.

and a Camell, a huge beast: there is nothinge therefore more rydiculous, than to strayne in, wyne and water, leaste in swallowinge a gnat thou hurte thy Jawes, but careleslye to suppe vp a Camell . . .

This adds a further quotation to those given in *O.E.D.*, and takes the idiom back to 1570.

Again, in the complete English translation of Calvin's *Harmonia* by Eusebius Paget in 1584, the Latin is independently rendered by 'straine at':¹

. . . Therefore they doe as much, as if a man shoulde straine at a crumme of bread, and swallow downe a whole loafe. VVee know that a gnat is a small creature, and a camell a great beast: nothing therefore is more ridiculous then to straine wine or water, leaste thou shouldest hurt the iawes with swallowing vp a gnat, but carelesly suppe vp a camell . . .

Thus Tymme in 1570 and Paget in 1584 provide further evidence that 'strain at' was a usage in vogue before 1611. It is worth noting too that the English text which serves as lemma in Tymme has 'strayne out' immediately followed by 'strain at' in Tymme's rendering of Calvin. The juxtaposition was thus not regarded as a discrepancy.

In translating the Latin *colare* or *excolare* by 'strain at', 'strain in', 'strain', the English translators think of the straining as done, not by pouring the liquid through a sieve-like strainer, but by making the lips and teeth serve as strainer, sucking in the liquid but rejecting the gnat. It is reasonable to suppose that the translators of 1611 knew and used Tymme's well-known translation of Marlorate.

CONSTANTIN HOPF.

BORROWINGS FROM *ROMEO AND JULIET* IN THE 'BAD' QUARTO OF *THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR*²

In the introduction to the Griggs facsimile edition of the first quarto of the *Merry Wives* (1602), P. A. Daniel first pointed out that line 1188,³ 'What is the reason that you use me thus?' comes from *Hamlet*, V. i. 312. So far as I can discover, however, no one has observed that the former text also contains three borrowings from *Romeo and Juliet*:

- (1) *M.W.W.*, Q1, lines 511-512.

Ay, sir, and as they say, she is not the first
Hath been led in a fool's paradise

¹ *A Harmonie Vpon The Three Euangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke . . . translated out of Latine into English*, by E.P., London, 1584, p. 617.

² Owing to war-time delays the author has not been able to read proofs of his note.—Ed. R.E.S.

³ This and subsequent citations of the bad quarto of the *Merry Wives* are based on the line-numbering of W. W. Greg's edition: *Shakespeare's Merry Wives of Windsor*, 1602, Oxford, 1910. Spelling and punctuation are modernized.

R. & J., II. iv. 175-176.

but first let me tell ye, if ye should lead
her into a fool's paradise, as they say¹
(Q1, but if you should lead her into a fool's
paradise, as they say.)

- (2) M.W.W., Q1, line 578.

Have you importuned her by any means?
(F1, Have you importuned her to such a purpose? II. ii. 221.)

R. & J., I. i. 138.

Have you importuned him by any means?
(Omitted from Q1.)

- (3) M.W.W., Q1, line 1108.

I'faith, I know not what to say
(F1, Now good Mistress Anne— III. iv. 57).

R. & J., IV. v. 140.

Faith, I know not what to say.
(Q1, I say nothing.)

Commenting on the *Hamlet* borrowing, Dr. Greg writes: 'The line must have been introduced into the *Merry Wives* either by the actor or the reporter, and in either case its appearance proves that in this particular at least the version of *Hamlet* which held the stage in 1601-2 agreed with the later and not the earlier text', i.e. with the good quarto of 1604, not the bad quarto of 1603,² in which the reading is 'What is the reason, sir, that you wrong me thus?' On the other hand, Professor G. L. Kittredge finds 'the expression so natural and commonplace that it need not be regarded as a quotation'.³ Professor Kittredge is right to be cautious about drawing conclusions from one passage; however, the presence of three other passages from *Romeo and Juliet* can hardly be explained as an accidental similarity. The *Romeo and Juliet* borrowings, moreover, pretty well limit Greg's alternative that the actor or reporter introduced the lines; the passages are inserted in speeches by three different characters: Mistress Quickly, Falstaff (into whose part the *Hamlet* line is also placed), and Slender. Surely it is easier to suppose the insertions to be the work of one reporter than of three different actors. Thus the *Romeo and Juliet* borrowings give additional support to Greg's reporter-theory of the first quarto of the *Merry Wives*.

In connection with Greg's inference that the Q2 text was the stage-version of *Hamlet* in 1601-2, it is interesting to note that of the three *Romeo and Juliet* insertions only the first is reproduced with reasonable fidelity in the bad quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*; the second is entirely absent,

¹ According to Bartlett's *Concordance* this is the only occurrence of the phrase 'fool's paradise' in Shakespeare. However, the important matter is not the reference to fool's paradise, which is of course proverbial, but the close similarity of wording in the two texts.

² Greg, *op. cit.*, p. 81.

³ *Complete Works of Shakespeare*, ed. Kittredge, Boston, 1936, p. 63.

and the third bears no verbal resemblance to the good text. Like the *Hamlet* line, these circumstances suggest that it was the Q2 rather than the Q1 (bad quarto) version of *Romeo and Juliet* which was on the boards in 1602, and hence is further indication that Q2 is the authoritative text.¹

HARRY R. HOPPE.

LADY HONORIA HOWARD²

Some years ago in the *Review of English Studies* Mr. Charles E. Ward suggested a possible source for the name used by John Dryden in *The Rival Ladies* for his chief female character, Honoria.³ The author takes note of a statement made by Edmund Malone⁴ that Dryden, because of a somewhat romantic interest in his cousin Honor Dryden, had given the name of Honoria to the important lady in his play. But this suggestion, says Mr. Ward, has always seemed very far-fetched, because the more probable source for the name is Honoria, the wife of Sir Robert Howard, his patron and brother-in-law after December 1663. Searching for justification of this idea, Mr. Ward indulges in considerable play of imagination. Using as a spring-board a chancery suit⁵ dated 1665 concerning the Lady Honoria, he jumps to the conclusion that she was married to Sir Robert in 1664, and that Dryden 'would have been privy to Howard's courtship even as early as 1663' (the date of *The Rival Ladies*).

Two facts Mr. Ward is apparently unaware of—the first that Honoria Englefield was a widow when she married Howard and hence would probably not enjoy a long courtship; the second that she was a rich ward of the King, who arranged the marriage to divert her fortune to the uses of one of his aspiring favourites, the son of the Earl of Berkshire, whose patrimony had been generously expended in the Stuart cause. The date of the marriage is not 'uncertain'; her first husband having died in May 1665, she was married to Howard on the tenth of August of that same year. Her position quickly became unbearable because of Sir Robert's increasing interest in the actress Susanna Uphill. Her petition to the King in 1667⁶ and her will in 1676⁷ both testify to the fact that little affection had ever existed between them. It is unlikely that Howard knew Honoria Englefield

¹ Since Mr. Hoppe's Note was accepted for publication in *R.E.S.*, Mr. A. Hart has published his *Stolne and Surreptitious Copies*. In a chapter entitled 'Inter-play Borrowings of the late Bad Quartos' (p. 393) he has noted the first of Mr. Hoppe's three borrowings.—Ed. *R.E.S.*

² Owing to war-time delays the author has been unable to read proofs.—Ed. *R.E.S.*

³ *R.E.S.*, XIII (July 1937), p. 300.

⁴ E. Malone, *Prose Works of John Dryden* (1800), I, 24.

⁵ C. 6/33/35. (P.R.O.).

⁶ *S. P. Dom.* 1667, f. 63, p. 495 (P.R.O.).

⁷ 122 Bence, 1676 (Somerset House documents).

in 1663, and Dryden obviously could not have been 'privy to his courtship' in that year, nor could the compliment have been offered to Sir Robert 'and his new bride' while Honoria was still the wife of Sir Francis Englefield.¹

A publication more recent than Mr. Ward's, James M. Osborn's *John Dryden: Some Biographical Facts and Problems*, calls attention to several items in Dryden's relationship with Honor Dryden—among them a letter written to her in 1665.² From these records it appears that Malone's idea is still not disproved, and it remains probable that Dryden's cousin Honor provided the name for Honoria in *The Rival Ladies*.

FLORENCE R. SCOTT.

CORRESPONDENCE

'THE EDITORIAL PROBLEM IN SHAKESPEARE'

THE EDITOR, *Review of English Studies*.

DEAR SIR,

May I be allowed to comment, as briefly as possible, on one aspect of Professor Maas's kindly and critical review, namely what he calls 'the tyranny of the copy-text'. It is no surprise to find a classical scholar objecting altogether to the notion of the copy-text, for, as I indicated in the second note on p. 182 of my book, it has no place in the editing of classical texts. It only comes into critical practice with the determination to preserve, at least in some measure, what I called the 'accidents' of the text. On pp. l-lv I gave my reasons for thinking that these should be preserved in a critical edition of Shakespeare, and Professor Maas's re-statement of the usual objections leaves my opinion unaltered. But what is interesting to observe is how this question of the copy-text affects critical theory at other points.

In § (3) of his review Professor Maas writes as follows: 'Dr. Greg distinguishes between "sporadic conflation", which would not affect the derivative character of the witness, and a conflation so extensive as to give the witness substantive character. The distinction seems to me arbitrary, because there can be no objective criterion for finding the limit between the two kinds of conflation, and useless, because if one variant of a text (as compared with its extant ancestor) is proved to be substantive [i.e. due to conflation with a non-extant source], then every one of its variants becomes potentially substantive and must be examined for authenticity just as if the witness were substantive in its own right'.

¹ See my article in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, LV (June 1940), 411-15.

² P. 46.

Now, the objection that the distinction is useless because every variant will have to be examined for authenticity might be brought against the distinction between a witness substantive in its own right and one substantive through conflation. But in this case even Professor Maas will acknowledge that the distinction is not useless, since on it depend the deductions to be drawn from certain agreements and disagreements among the witnesses. As regards sporadic and persistent conflation, I am not troubled by the fact that the distinction is 'arbitrary', for I did not invent it, it is there in the evidence: the two classes are sharply differentiated. And it happens to be not so much useful as essential to the editor of Shakespeare that I have in view, because upon it will in most cases depend his choice of copy-text.

Somewhat similar is the criticism that Professor Maas makes at the end of § (4). "The characterization of the quartos of *Rich. III* and *King Lear* as reported is not based on the general quality of their text, but on certain peculiarities of their variation from F. Thus where F is wholly derivative from an extant quarto not much superior in quality to that of *Rich. III*, we can never be sure that the quarto is not a "well-reported" one.' This is a subtle point and well taken. I wonder whether Professor Maas has any particular play in mind. I have no defence in theory. Only, while admitting that it is mainly through comparison with F that the quartos of *Rich. III* and *Lear* reveal their character as reports, I should demur to the statement that this character is not to some extent evident even in the general quality of the text. Thus, if a reported text were reprinted without alteration in F, I should not be altogether without hope of being able to detect its character. After all, *Pericles* has been often classed as a bad quarto, although we have no alternative text with which to compare it, and I even suggested that it might be a report of the same kind as the quarto of *Lear*. Moreover, considering the way in which the folio editors treated the bad quartos and the texts of *Rich. III* and *Lear*, I am trustful enough to think that when they did reprint a quarto without material alteration, it is some evidence that it contained what they considered a reputable text.

W. W. GREG.

The
Paris.
Press, r
Though
French
tempted
Didot-L
aspect o
ceits of
romanc
treats o
with th
largely
and fro
and de
Monm
links w
romanc
stories
wrote
Let
literary
but is
us wh
conclu
Introd
nounc
scripts
thing
This
time b
each o
source
in the
omissi
tive w
emenc
intenc
explai
Frenc
remai
convic
the m
assiste
plot,
11

REVIEWS

The Didot-Perceval according to the Manuscripts of Modena and Paris. Edited by WILLIAM ROACH. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941; London: H. Milford, 1942. Pp. xii+348. 24s. net.

Though this is primarily a solid and substantial edition for specialists in mediæval French literature (or rather literary history), the English student is likely to be tempted to dip into it because of the possible and probable relationships of the *Didot-Perceval* with well-known mediæval English texts, and because any aspect of the Arthurian cycle may have its light to throw on his own dark conceits of King Arthur. For the *Didot-Perceval* is a heterogeneous tripartite prose-romance collection made in the first decade of the thirteenth century, which treats of Merlin, of the many adventures of Perceval—especially those connected with the Quest of the Holy Grail—and of the *Mort Artu*. Moreover, though largely an amorphous compilation based on prosifications of Robert de Boron and from Chrétien de Troyes's *Li Contes del Graal*, its account of the passing and death of Arthur must have been derived from lost versions of Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*. The compilation, too, has some possible links with the English alliterative *Morte Arthur* and with Malory's prose epic romance, as well as with Layamon's *Brut* (through Wace), and perhaps with the stories of the childhood of Perceval which Chaucer had in memory when he wrote his *Sir Thopas*.

Let it be said at once, therefore, that Dr. Roach is not mindful of matters of literary relationship between the Arthurian romances of France and England, but is making his appeal exclusively to French specialists. He does not even tell us whether anything in the language of the two manuscripts he edits affords conclusive evidence of composition in France rather than in England: for in his Introduction of 114 pages he strictly adheres to the decision deliberately announced in the Preface to give no study whatever of the language of his manuscripts because he is quite sure that nothing in the language could reveal anything about the authorship or date.

This edition—apart from the very considerable value of having for the first time both the Modena and the Paris version of the *Didot-Perceval* printed above each other page by page—is to be regarded as a fundamental study in origins and sources, which does not even seek to indicate any literary qualities there may be in the texts. There are an excellent bibliography (though one may wonder at the omission of Faral's great study *La Légende Arthurienne* where Bruce's authoritative work is given its proper place), very condensed notes of textual variants and emendations, and a useful glossary of proper names. But though the work seems intended for specialists, the glossary is only the barest select vocabulary of words explained in utmost brevity for those who 'have an elementary knowledge of Old French'. The Introduction seems in its kind altogether admirable, and likely to remain as an authoritative monograph. It treats, with thoroughness, clarity, and convincing presentation of its special theory, of the origins of the texts, the title, the manuscripts, the beginnings of the text and its composition and sources: it assists the student of some very complex literary history with a summary of the plot, and then handles fully matters of date and authorship.

But if the English student is disappointed at the omissions in Dr. Roach's elaborate and scholarly Introduction, this is not necessarily a just cause of complaint, since French specialists are the presumed users of the book: and the very convenient method of printing the two versions of the *Didot-Perceval* and the slim glossary aimed at the student with just an elementary knowledge of Old French, will make it easy for him to read quickly through the texts, so that he may make his own judgement on possible affinities with the mediæval Arthurian English romances he has read and of the literary and historical interest of the French. Whether the French specialist will deplore the lack of anything like an exegetical commentary on the texts, the thinness and absence of philological material in the glossary and the deliberate exclusion of even the barest examination of the language, it is not for a reviewer who is concerned primarily with English literature to say.

Dr. Roach has performed a notable service to scholarship in making so thorough and definitive a study of the origins and sources of the *Didot-Perceval*, and in making its two versions for the first time so conveniently available.

C. L. WRENN.

Technogamia. By BARTEN HOLYDAY. A Critical Edition by Sister M. Jean Carmel Cavanaugh. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press. 1942. Pp. lxxviii + 253. No price given.

Technogamia: or the Marriages of the Arts by Barten Holyday, a young student of that society, was first acted at Christ Church, Oxford, in February 1617, and again before James I at Woodstock in August 1621. Wood tells us that, after enduring two acts, the King 'offr'd several times to withdraw', and was only persuaded to remain until the conclusion 'least the young men should be discouraged'. One cannot but sympathize with him, for Holyday has the tediousness of a king, and can find it in him to bestow it all upon our worships. A multitude of loosely-connected scenes, almost entirely in prose, reveal the quarrels, intrigues, and deficiencies of certain of the liberal arts and their servants, and there is some occasional and not very effective satire on the pseudo-arts of Magic and Astrology and on the insufficiently liberal arts of Medicine and Common Law. At the conclusion of the play *Polites*, the chief magistrate, banishes Magic and Astrology, rebukes (in the persons of *Medicus* and *Causidicus*) Medicine and Common Law, and marries *Geographus* (who has been made to dismiss his servant *Phantastes*, a teller of tall stories) to *Astronomia*, *Geometres* to *Arithmetica*, *Poeta* (who is supposed to have been reformed) to *Historia*, *Grammaticus* to *Rhetorica*, and *Melancholico*, *Poeta's* servant, to *Musica*. As in much of the inferior literature of that time, there is, as it were, the form, the appearance, of wit and humour without the substance—an endless flow of cheerful babble which continually pretends to be what it is not. As the editor claims in her Introduction and industriously attempts in her Explanatory Notes, some image of the confused and parti-coloured world-picture of the time can indeed be recovered, but there is scarcely anything that is not more vividly and memorably present in other sources.

The text of the play has been reproduced in facsimile from a copy of the, on the whole, carefully printed First Quarto of 1618—a practice which, when the copy-text requires little correction, when the variants in other copies or editions are of little importance, and when, as with an academic thesis, cost of production must be reduced to a minimum, is perhaps legitimate, but which makes it

impos
text fo
the o
book
final
such
seem
in no
two d
that c
recogn
for ex
'mayo
Wi
after
given
diffic
the w
turn b
being
these
'Note
recom
begin
Th
somet
Logic
quite
the a
from
Engli
I
thin
he m
Engli
misin
trover
'a rop
joke
Nash
from
Mi
Univ
\$3.50
Mr. V
zealo
has
deep

impossible to print the notes where (especially with a work mainly valuable as a text for comment) they are most wanted, at the foot of the page. The variants in the only other edition, the Second Quarto of 1630, are recorded at the end of the book in a series of Textual Notes. Most of them are examples of the removal of final 'e' and of more normal or modern spellings such as 'here' for 'heere'. Since such records are presumably compiled for some purpose, and since it has long seemed to the reviewer that their only purpose can be to illustrate the progress in normalization of spelling (after allowance has been made for the practice of two different printing-houses) between two given dates, he ventures to hope that editors who find it necessary to record such 'variants' will at some time recognize it as part of their duty to provide a brief statistical table, telling us that, for example, of spellings with final 'e' and of spellings with 'y' for 'i', such as 'mayd', Q2 has retained 'x', normalized 'y', and added 'z'.

With a little thought, reference to the Explanatory Notes, which are printed after the text, might have been made far more convenient. Page-references are given, but, since they are tucked away among the line-references, they are often difficult to find, and, since only the lines of each of the five acts, not the lines of the whole play, have been numbered continuously, it is usually necessary to turn back, first to the scene-reference, and then to the act-reference (each of them being given once only), in order to discover to which scene the notes refer. All these difficulties might have been avoided by the use of a running-title: either, 'Notes on Act I, Sc. ii, ll. 15-51', or, if (a practice which has everything to recommend it) the lines of the play had been numbered continuously from beginning to end, 'Notes on ll. 15-51'.

The notes themselves, though careful and conscientious, are often too long, sometimes unnecessary, and sometimes erroneous. When, on p. 28, ll. 213 ff., Logicus asks Causidicus whether he is a Civil or an uncivil lawyer, the editor is quite wrong in saying (p. 157) that Logicus is 'directing a thrust at civil law': the author, like many university men, is satirizing common lawyers as distinct from academic civilians. When, on p. 65, ll. 790 ff., Poeta repeats one of his English elegiac couplets and Magus exclaims:

Hay day! he's at's *Hexameter* and *Pentameter* Verses in our tongue: 'faith I thinke in some such humour this kind of Verses was first made amongst vs.

he means by 'this kind of Verses' attempts to reproduce classical metres in English: the note (p. 197, l. 793), 'Another allusion to erotic love poetry', both misinterprets the text and fails to notice a late and lingering echo of an old controversy. There are many superfluous notes, but there is none on p. 76, ll. 363-4, 'a rope on his sixe-footed lowsie *Hexameters*': for other examples of this ancient joke about the six-footed louse and the six-footed hexameter, see McKerrow's *Nashe*, III, 86, ll. 23 ff., and note thereon, and the Second Part of the *Return from Parnassus*, l. 2116.

J. B. LEISHMAN.

Milton's Literary Milieu. By GEORGE WESLEY WHITING. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press; London: H. Milford. 1939. Pp. xvi+401. \$3.50; 16s. net.

Mr. Whiting sets out with excellent intentions. He dissociates himself from 'the zealous scholar intent at all costs upon establishing some cherished theory'. He has 'a profound distrust of many studies intended to prove that Milton was deeply indebted to specific sources'. He has tried, he says, 'to survey somewhat

systematically and comprehensively the contemporary setting of Milton's work'. He is 'primarily interested not in sources, but in tracing the currency of ideas'.

The task proposed, therefore, is worthy of a literary historian of the first order, endowed, in Mr. Whiting's words, with 'powers of perception, analysis, judgment and expression granted only to the elect'. It would not be fair to complain that the four hundred pages of performance do not perfectly fulfil the twelve pages of promise, for the author is modestly aware that his reach exceeds his grasp; but it is a legitimate ground of criticism that the whole direction of his effort is different from that which the Preface had led us to expect. It is, in fact, hardly distinguishable from that of the parallel-hunter, except in its repudiation of the virtue of precision. At every stage we are presented with extracts from books and pamphlets long and short, wise and foolish, known and unknown, which we are invited to notice, observe, or consider; after which we are asked to 'recall now Milton's description of the Firmament' (p. 28), or to 'consider also the geography of the Moloch passage' (p. 202), or to observe that 'in opposing Episcopacy Milton and Lord Brooke agree upon essentials' (p. 309), or that 'both Burton and Milton . . . reached the same conclusion—that much of what passes for human learning is futile' (p. 165). It will be no fault of Milton's commentators if this latter opinion has not many more than two supporters to-day. An alluring invitation on p. 110 proves disappointing, though for a moment it seems to offer the prospect of escape from the prevailing monotony: 'Returning to Paradise, recall the lines alluding to the grove of Daphne'. We only wish we could, but even in the grove of Daphne we still pursue terrestrial courses.

It is not an encouraging reflection, but the large class of books of which this is typical raises a doubt whether the scholar of Macaulay's generation, steeped in the Bible, profoundly interested in the Puritans and their history, and with a competent knowledge of the classics, was not better qualified to follow Milton to the height of his great argument than people who ransack libraries in the hope of discovering his sources, or, as Mr. Whiting would say, re-creating his milieu. Let me give one example. In the third chapter of his *History* Macaulay has a lively description of those several dynasties of ruffians, the Muns, the Tityre Tus, the Hectors, the Mohawks and the rest, whose favourite amusement was 'to swagger by night about the town, breaking windows, upsetting sedans, beating quiet men, and offering rude caresses to pretty women'. He adds in a footnote: 'It may be suspected that some of the Tityre Tus, like good Cavaliers, broke Milton's windows shortly after the Restoration. I am confident that he was thinking of those pests of London when he dictated the noble lines:

And in luxurious cities, when the noise
Of riot ascends above their loftiest towers,
And injury and outrage, and when night
Darkens the streets, then wander forth the sons
Of Belial, flown with insolence and wine'.

That is enlightened criticism, and a real elucidation of Milton's meaning. It would not have occurred to Macaulay to explain what is meant by 'the sons of Belial'. Reference to a Concordance shows that Belial himself, or the men, or sons, or children, of Belial are mentioned in the Bible fifteen times, and Macaulay would never have doubted that all or most of these allusions were well known to his readers. Mr. Whiting, quoting the same passage with extensions, devotes a whole chapter to extracts from sermons and obscure pamphlets in which the

wicked, or the writer's opponents, are denounced as 'children of Belial'. He is indebted to Newton's researches for the discovery that these characters are mentioned in three books of the Old Testament, and gives chapter and verse; but immediately afterwards he makes the astonishing statement that, whereas 'many of the first readers of *Paradise Lost* were keenly aware of the connotations of the terms *Belial* and *Sons of Belial*', these terms 'have for modern readers none at all'. If that is true the modern reader would do well to leave Milton alone until he has repaired this lamentable deficiency in his knowledge. In the continuation Mr. Whiting seems to attach some importance to the discovery that 'frequently Christ and Belial are contrasted', and quotes from *British Lightning or Suddaine tumults, A Divine Project to Save a Kingdome*, and other pamphlets to demonstrate the fact. He does not mention the fountain-head of all these effusions, which is the Second Book of Corinthians, Chapter 6, verse 15: 'And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?'

It is, perhaps, even more remarkable that Mr. Whiting has not availed himself of the labours of a different kind of research, even when its path crosses his own. Professor Saurat thinks himself justified in assuming, on grounds of internal evidence and historical probability, that Milton was influenced by the cabbalistic works of Robert Fludd, and this belief leads him to interpret 'offspring of Heaven firstborn', in Milton's invocation to light, as a designation of the Second Person of the Trinity. Professor Sewell, relying on a passage in Wollebius, concludes that Milton is addressing physical light; and we are obliged to admit the force of his argument when he reminds us that the *Compendium* of Wollebius and the *Medulla* of William Ames were the authorities constantly consulted by Milton in the composition of *De Doctrina Christiana*. Mr. Whiting does not mention either Fludd or Ames or Wollebius. His comment on this much disputed passage is that 'in accounts of creation praise of light is common' (p. 27), and, that we may assure ourselves of the fact, we are asked to 'observe the following excerpt from Raleigh's *History*' and to 'recall also Purchas's eulogy of light', both of which are quoted.

Another passage which still excites volumes of controversy occurs in the account of the creation:

Necessity and chance
Approach not me, and what I will is fate.

Professor Saurat recognizes in these and the preceding lines the theory of 'retraction', another deposit from the cabbalistic deluge directed by Fludd. It is doubtful whether his version of the theory can properly be attributed to Milton, especially since the appearance of Professor Sewell's *Study of Milton's Christian Doctrine*; but, however that may be, the problem certainly lies within the scope of an attempt 'to survey somewhat systematically and comprehensively the contemporary setting of Milton's thought'. Mr. Whiting takes it in his stride in his summary of Raleigh's *History of the World*. He remarks on Raleigh's authority that *Necessity* and *Fate* were titles applied by some philosophers to God, as denoting a power 'which bindeth by inevitable ordinance'. This is clearly irrelevant, and Mr. Whiting finds it necessary to supply some semblance of common ground by explaining, after quoting Milton's lines for comparison, that neither Raleigh nor Milton can have meant what he said.

There is some reason to believe that the habit of murmuring 'Hast thou this thing of thyself or did another tell it thee?' had begun to trouble Milton in his

lifetime, for his widow was probably repeating his words when, 'on being asked by some visitors whether her husband had not been a great reader of Homer and Virgil, she resented the question, thinking it implied plagiarism, and answered with some eagerness that her husband stole from nobody but the muse that inspired him, and that muse was God's Holy Spirit'.¹ Milton, said Coleridge, 'attracts all forms and things to himself, into the unity of his own ideal'.² That is the grain of truth embedded in Milton's or the widow's self-delusion. It was magnificently said of Ben Jonson, but could be said far more truthfully of Milton, that his appropriations are not thefts but conquests.

P. L. CARVER.

London in Flames, London in Glory. Poems on the Fire and Rebuilding of London, 1666-1709. Edited by ROBERT ARNOLD AUBIN. (Rutgers University Studies in English, No. 3). New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press. 1943. Pp. xvi+383. \$4.50.

One of the characteristic features of Restoration literary activity is the large amount of verse produced not as a means of expression of the human spirit but in order to satisfy a social requirement. Verse was wanted both by individuals for the commemoration of episodes in their own lives and by a larger public for the description of striking or important events; the business of the writers who set out to supply it, whether professional or amateur, was to meet the immediate needs; at their best they might achieve something of permanent value; but that was a secondary object. One section of this production, the verse written for the labouring classes and small shopkeepers and the like, the ballads, has always attracted attention and has been fairly thoroughly explored; what may be described as the verse of the middle classes has on the whole been neglected. It has little merit as poetry; much of it was produced frankly for commercial ends; its importance, apart from the information which its contents provide for historians of various kinds, is in the light which its character throws, on the one hand on social and economic factors in literary activity, on the other on the moral and intellectual development of the middle classes.

The poems collected by Mr. Aubin may be taken as fair specimens of the production for the middle classes. He has brought together, with two exceptions, all the poems in English which he has found relating either to the Great Fire of 1666 or to the rebuilding of London or of particular buildings; the exceptions are *Annus Mirabilis* and a ballad reprinted by Mr. Rollins (poems containing casual allusions are excluded; one poem reprinted, on the new Bethlehem Hospital, is more or less irrelevant, as the old hospital was not affected by the fire). Altogether there are thirty-two items, ranging in date from 1666 to 1709; eighteen of them date from before 1670. One consists of two acrostics and an anagram; two are ballads; another, written by a shopkeeper in the Royal Exchange to advocate one of two alternative schemes for its rebuilding, is very close to the ballads, and includes an attractive description of two girls shopping in the Exchange. One piece is perhaps by Robert Wild; that it is as literature one of the best pieces in the collection indicates the general level. Of the more pretentious pieces three are by Simon Ford, a clergyman who possessed some reputation as a Latin poet; these are English versions of his own Latin poems, overburdened with classical allusions and generally bad; but classical

¹ Masson, *Life of Milton*, Vol. VI, p. 746.

² *Biographia Literaria*, Chap. xv.

allusions are far too frequent in most of the earlier pieces. One of the best of them in this respect is a long religious tract in verse by another clergyman, John Tabor (only the section relating to the fire is reprinted). 'Composed in a familiar kind of couplett Verse, as being for the most part Reprehensive, and Hortatory, therein condescending to the meanest capacities, as meant for the use and benefit of all', if rather rough in workmanship, it has the merit of sincerity. Four poems dealing with the destruction and rebuilding of St. Paul's, the first published in 1668, the last in 1709, are by James Wright, the antiquary and historian of Rutland; written in the same quatrains as *Annus Mirabilis*, they show some good if rather elementary observation. Among the other writers are a nonconformist divine announcing the wrath to come in the time of the Popish Plot and a visitor from Transylvania, whose Latin original is represented by a contemporary English version. In general the more earthbound the writers the better their products.

The majority of the pieces are in decasyllabic couplets, but several show the diffusion of relatively new forms. One J. A. imitates Cowley's pindaric odes; Jeremiah Wells, a divine and minor poet, like Wright, employs the quatrains of *Gondibert* and *Annus Mirabilis*; he wrote almost certainly after the publication of the latter poem and there is perhaps some imitation. The style of most of the earlier pieces, with Tabor's as a noteworthy exception, appears to be a vulgarized derivative from that in fashion in the first half of the century. Although it would be difficult to prove it in most cases, some of the writers may be suspected of making frequent use of Joshua Poole's *English Parnassus*.

The earlier pieces are disappointing as materials for the history of the fire. The writers lack the imaginative powers necessary for its re-creation; the literary conventions adopted by them render precise description impossible. These defects are present even in a writer who gives a day by day and night by night history of the terrible week; the impressions left by it are generalized treatment, stock classical allusions, and all the other commonplaces. The most valuable contribution made by these writers is probably that to the social history of the fire; the protests against the high charges made for carting goods are noteworthy. The fire is invariably regarded as a divine dispensation, but opinions differ as to what sin it was to punish; the sermons relating to it probably deal with this topic more fully and more satisfactorily.

The poems on the rebuilding are not perceptibly better as literature than those about the disaster, but suffer less from disparity between subject and treatment. There are no obvious allusions to Wren's or any of the other projects for a general replanning; the rebuilding act of 1667 is welcomed, but the rebuilding as a whole did not lend itself even to such treatment as these writers could provide. Individual buildings offered better opportunities. The Monument has a poem; the Royal Exchange and St. Paul's have miniature garlands; St. Mary-le-Bow is used as a pretext for a satire on the city authorities in 1679. In general these poems contain little information that cannot be better obtained elsewhere.

The reprinting of the texts appears to be accurate. Mr. Aubin has taken the task of commentator light-heartedly, perhaps too much so. He uses to advantage an enviable knowledge of the minor literature of the time; although he provides many useful notes, his treatment of history and topography and occasionally of language is less satisfactory. In the introductions to the poems some discussion of Wild's claim to the piece attributed to him is desirable; Tabor's preface to his

poem is worth reprinting at some length; the characterization of the various pieces is inadequate. The commentary includes a few errors and some rather futile conjectures; a more serious defect is the number of passages for which no elucidation is offered. Mr. Aubin's failure to deal satisfactorily with the poem on Bow Church is, however, not so much a sign of weakness on his part as a tribute to the difficulties of the piece.¹

Altogether Mr. Aubin has produced a book which should give great pleasure to the lover of old London; and especially to readers who enjoy playing the antiquary and joining in the elucidation of minor problems.

E. S. DE BEER.

The Critical Works of John Dennis, Vol. II, 1711-1729. Edited by EDWARD NILES HOOKER. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1943. Pp. cxliv+587. \$7.50; 43s. 6d. net (two volumes).

The first volume of Mr. Hooker's edition of the *Critical Works* has already been reviewed in *R.E.S.*² With the publication of this second volume his task is completed, and it may now be said that he has made one of the most thorough and useful contributions to English scholarship in recent years. This second volume contains the critical writings of John Dennis from 1711-1729, including the *True Character of Mr. Pope* ('the pamphlet as a whole was unquestionably written by Dennis'), together with an Appendix of various minor pieces from 1693-1728. Though this volume gives a less favourable impression of Dennis the critic, it is full of interest for students of Addison, Pope, and Steele, and it throws a great deal of rather chequered light on dramatic history and the dramatic standards of the period.

In a lengthy Introduction Mr. Hooker deals with the canon of Dennis's writings, his personal relationships, critical theories, critical opinions, and reputation as a critic.³ Mr. Hooker knows his man, and he should convince even the sceptical that this much-ridiculed and often-wronged critic is worth knowing. 'Neither of us would choose him for a friend', Aaron Hill wrote to Pope, 'but none of the frailties of his temper, any more than the heavy formalities of his style, can prevent your acknowledging that there is often weight in his arguments, and matter, that deserves encouragement, to be met with in his writings'. It is

¹ Mr. Aubin is puzzled by the 'Elephants' in this piece; if one may hazard a conjecture the allusion is perhaps to Francis *alias* Elephant Smith, the Whig bookseller (an account of him is given in H. R. Plomer, *A Dictionary of the Printers . . . 1668 to 1725*). The book-making is very bad. The notes are placed at the end of the book and the method of linking them to the text is so inadequate that it is almost impossible to refer to them unless one uses two book-markers or inserts page-references. The index is badly set out, a separate alphabetical series for London interrupting the general series, without being adequately distinguished by the repetition of the word 'London' at the head of each column. There are rather too few subject entries. While giving precise bibliographical details for the various pieces reprinted, Mr. Aubin gives no general bibliography. The best for the older literature of the fire appears to be that in Charles Welch, *History of the Monument*, 1893.

² Vol. XVIII, 1942, pp. 115-18.

³ There are signs that the individual sections have been written at different times, for there are a number of repetitions that might have been eliminated. We are twice told (pp. xiv, li) that Dryden had been warned that Dennis might traduce his memory; and that Steele had heard Dennis read his *Battle of Ramillia* and was highly pleased with it (pp. xxxi, lv). On three successive pages (pp. xxxiii ff.) we learn that Steele, Cibber, and Booth had heard Dennis read his tragedy, *The Invader of his Country*. Other examples might be cited.

to his editor's credit that he has shown clearly what there was in Dennis that deserved encouragement, without ever losing his sense of proportion or pleading for a complete reversal of the popular judgement. Dennis is reinstated; he is not set on a pedestal. But several facts emerge quite unmistakably. For one thing, Dennis was much the most serious critic of his day; in an age of party strife and personalities he had, as his editor claims, a 'virtually exclusive interest in literature', and never wavered in his passion for great poetry or in the high value he set upon it. This very earnestness made him something of a curiosity, and even at times a figure of fun, to a generation which held that politeness and delicacy and a certain lack of emphasis were almost as important to the literary artist as to the man of fashion. Dennis was swimming against the tide for the greater part of his life, and in his later years the splashing of the exhausted athlete becomes more and more noticeable. Now that his critical pieces can be read conveniently in their chronological order, it becomes apparent how much his reputation has suffered from the lamentable productions of his decline. There is occasionally shrewd criticism in the pieces printed in Mr. Hooker's second volume, but to see Dennis at his best one must read what he wrote up to 1704, the year which saw the publication of his *Grounds of Criticism in Poetry*. Dennis was then forty-seven; he was fifty-four when he first rounded on Pope, and seventy-two when he flung his last home-made grenade, *Remarks upon . . . the Dunciad*. There are two good reasons why his criticism deteriorated so sharply after middle age: he failed to keep in touch with modern developments in literature, and he was goaded by satirical attacks and private misfortunes to express himself in a form of personal criticism for which he was unsuited. Strange as it may seem, Mr. Hooker is perfectly justified in his claim that Dennis was little interested in the play of personality, and that 'his prime interest was literature and learning'. He was severe enough with Blackmore, but the *Remarks on Prince Arthur* are really concerned with the poem and with the nature of epic poetry. No doubt Dennis was often carried away by the ardour of the pursuit and wrote in a blunt and uncompromising fashion about his contemporaries; but it is not until he falls foul of Pope and Steele in his later years that he swerves aside from his honest search for the truth. Yet it is that later Dennis, perverse, blundering, bad-tempered, and making mountains out of mole-hills, that is too often remembered. All this is made abundantly clear by Mr. Hooker; and if he fails to emphasize sufficiently any one cause operating against the reputation of Dennis it is that 'heavy formality of style' which Hill noted, and which sometimes gives one the impression that Dennis 'means not, but blunders round about a meaning'. Dennis, however, knew what he meant. In Section IV of his Introduction Mr. Hooker expounds his critical theories at length, showing how he stood in relation to his age, and what original contributions he made to aesthetics. It is unlikely that Dennis will ever again slip back into the comparative obscurity from which his editor has now rescued him.

One or two points in the Introduction call for comment. Mr. Hooker twice refers to 'a Mr. Hungerford' and 'a certain gentleman named Hungerford'; this is surely John Hungerford, a well-known lawyer who defended John Matthews and Christopher Sayer from the charge of treason. A short account of him will be found in *D.N.B.* On p. xxxix it is suggested that Dennis and Rowe were probably acquainted by 1703 since a 'Mr. Row' is listed among the subscribers to the *Grounds of Criticism*; it is perhaps worth remarking that in the catalogue of Rowe's library there is an item, 'Dennis on Modern Poetry', which may refer to

The Advancement and Reform of Modern Poetry, 1701. On p. xli it is stated that Thomas Cooke 'showed his hostility to Pope in a poem called *The Battle of the Poets*'. It was not, however, until the second (revised) version of Cooke's poem, published in 1729, that Pope was attacked. Of Gildon it is said (p. xl) that though he was a literary hack and party writer he was far from contemptible: 'Wycherley and Addison would not have received him if he had been without ability'. Perhaps not, but Gildon had not always been a hack; he was a gentleman's son, and had no doubt the manners and the conversation of a gentleman to recommend him even in the days of his poverty. This whole section on Dennis's personal relationships is remarkably full and informative. Mr. Hooker may now add to the account the satirical references to Dennis made by Charles Johnson in *The Generous Husband* (*R.E.S.*, Vol. XIX, 1943, pp. 213-4).

Mr. Hooker removes from the canon of the critic's works *A New Project for the Regulation of the Stage*, and states that it was summarized in Pope's *Peri Bathous*, though in a note on p. 476 he says that he has not seen the pamphlet. If Chapter xvi of the *Peri Bathous* really is, as it purports to be, a summary of the *New Project* of 1720 that would surely link the pamphlet very closely with Pope, who had wit enough of his own not to be forced to incorporate at such length other men's jokes in his prose satires. Mr. Hooker goes so far as to admit that the facts suggest that Pope was 'pry to the secret of its authorship'. Do they not rather suggest that the *New Project*, if it ever comes to light, should be added to the canon of Pope's prose satires? The fact that Mr. Hooker has been unable to trace a single copy of a pamphlet that was certainly being advertised in the newspapers of 1720 suggests that it had little sale at the time. If it was the work of Pope, it would not be out of keeping with his thrifty habits to give the public, in the *Peri Bathous* of 1728, another chance to laugh at a joke which had apparently failed to amuse them in 1720. It seems less likely that he would summarize an obscure satire, now eight years old, which had been written by someone else, and use it as the concluding chapter (pp. 85-92) of the *Peri Bathous*. An enquiry for this pamphlet was made in *R.E.S.*, Vol. XVII, 1941, p. 494, but no information about it has so far been received.

JAMES R. SUTHERLAND.

SHORT NOTICE

The Road to Hel. By HILDA RODERICK ELLIS. Cambridge, at the University Press. 1943. Pp. viii+208. 12s. 6d. net.

Dr. Ellis has made a study of the conception of the dead in Old Norse Literature which is distinguished by its fullness and the honesty with which she refuses to draw tempting conclusions. There is, as she shows, no want of evidence in literature as in archaeology of strong beliefs in continued existence after death: the trouble is that there are too many conflicting or inconsistent beliefs not only in successive periods and in different places but simultaneously in the same place and, often, in the same mind. There is the conception of existence after death in another world, or with the body in the grave-mound; there are various conceptions of the relation between the world of the living and the world of the dead, and varying cults accordingly. When one considers the variety of beliefs within Christianity itself, which has some definite dogmas as a centre for speculation, this variety and inconsistency is not surprising, and Dr. Ellis has succeeded in bringing together a rich collection of instances.

E. C. B.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY ALICE WALKER AND GLADYS D. WILLCOCK

E.L.H., Vol. 10, No. 3, September 1943—

Antaeus or poetic language and the actual world (Theodore Spencer), pp. 173-92.

The perpetual necessity of poetry to return to the linguistic norm.

Giordano Bruno on translations (Angelo M. Pellegrini), pp. 193-207.

Extent of Bruno's influence on the Elizabethan translation movement up to Florio.

Dean Donne sets his text (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 208-29.

Extent of Donne's scholarship as indicated by his use of different Biblical versions.

Chips from Milton's workshop (J. Milton French), pp. 230-42.

Deletions, changes and additions in 7 pp. of the Trinity College MS.

Johnson's distrust of the imagination (Raymond D. Havens), pp. 243-55.

— No. 4, December 1943—

Hildeburg and Hengest (Kemp Malone), pp. 257-84.

Robert Henryson and the socio-economic scene (Marshall W. Stearns), pp. 285-93.

Captain Robert Julian, Secretary to the Muses (Brice Harris), pp. 294-309.

A Restoration 'satyr-monger': lampoons and libels distributed by him.

Swift's economic views and mercantilism (Louis A. Landa), pp. 310-35.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. 58, No. 7, November 1943—

The early date for Marlowe's *Faustus* (P. H. Kocher), pp. 539-42.

Evidence for an English Faust-book by 1589.

Ferdinando Freckleton and the Spenser circle (E. A. Strathmann), pp. 542-4.

The telescope and the comic imagination (H. G. Dick), pp. 544-8.

Dramatic and other humour at Galileo's expense.

Amoretti, Sonnet I (A. C. Judson), pp. 548-50.

On the sonnet written on a blank page of the Gollancz *Faerie Queene*.

A note on Suckling's *A Session of the Poets* (R. C. Bald), pp. 550-1.

On the 'Bartlets' mentioned in the poem.

Milton, Sappho (?) and Demetrius (Scott Elledge), pp. 551-3.

Byron's epitaph to Boatswain (B. R. McEldery, Jr.), pp. 553-4.

Possible connection between Byron's epitaph on a dog and Dr. Percival's epitaph on 'Sylvia', *Annual Register*, 1777.

A source for Hardy's *A Committee-man of 'the Terror'* (R. L. Purdy), pp. 554-5.

The Journal of Mary Frampton, 1885.

Yeats's first two published poems (R. K. Alspach), pp. 555-7.

Two poems omitted from all bibliographies.

Trollope and Henry James in 1868 (Harold Cooper), p. 558.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, No. 7, November 1943—

- The 'untraced quotation' of Ernest Dowson's dedication (Bruce A. Morissette), pp. 558-9.
Source in Flaubert's *Education Sentimentale*.

— No. 8, December 1943—

- Pater's use of Greek quotations (Helen H. Law), pp. 575-85.
Notes on Sir Richard Blackmore (E. Hudson Long), pp. 585-9.
The first English dictionary, Cawdrey's *Table Alphabeticall* (Gertrude E. Noyes), pp. 600-5.
The source of the subtitle to Chaucer's *Tale of Philomela* (C. E. Wien), pp. 605-7.
Source of *Deus dator formarum* in Averroes-Avicenna tradition.
The Sources of Spenser's Britomartis (J. E. Hankins), pp. 607-10.
Liber Mythologiae of Natalis Comes.
John Donne and Pierio Valeriano (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 610-12.
Henry Vaughan's *The Ass* (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 612-14.
Harington's Fountain (Margaret Trotter), pp. 614-16.
The Harington fountain at Kelston as inspiration of an interpolation in *Orlando Furioso*.
Sir John Harington's pen name (Allen H. Gilbert), pp. 616-17.
Misacmos for Misauchmos?
An inedited Burns letter (DeLancey Ferguson), pp. 617-20.
Keats's 'Gather the rose' (H. E. Briggs), pp. 620-23.
Source neither Tasso nor Herrick, but Spenser.
An early review of the Shelleys' *Six Weeks' Tour* (Marcel Kessel), p. 623.
Dating a letter by Horace Walpole (Herbert Greenberg), p. 624.
Support for Mitford's dating of letter describing performance of Mason's *Elfrida* as November 19, 1773, not 1772 (Draper).

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. 38, No. 4, October 1943—

- The second English satirist (Arnold Stein), pp. 274-8.
Marston's indebtedness to Hall.
The development of a stock character. II. the stage Scotsman; III. the stage Welshman (to 1800) (J. O. Bartley), pp. 279-88.
Continued from *M.L.R.*, Vol. 38 (1942), p. 438.
'Marguerite' (Iris E. Sells), pp. 289-97.
Matthew Arnold's love poetry.
Montesquieu and British education in the eighteenth century (F. T. H. Fletcher), pp. 298-306.
An allusion to the Romance of *Partonope of Blois* in the fifteenth century tale of Guiscardo and Ghismonda (Herbert G. Wright), p. 340.
More notes on Chapman's plays (George G. Loane), pp. 340-7.
Continued from *M.L.R.*, Vol. 33, No. 2, April 1938.

— Vol. 39, No. 1, January 1944—

- Science and information in English writings of the fifteenth century (H. S. Bennett), pp. 1-8.
An experiment in memorial reconstruction (Betty Shapin), pp. 9-17.
Hamlet, Q1, in the light of a recent experiment.
The With-Myrgings of *Widsith* (Kemp Malone), pp. 55-6.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 173

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. 58,

No. 4, Part 1, December 1943—

The pronunciation of Latin loan words and foreign words in Old English (Thomas Pyles), pp. 891-910.

Towneley XX: the *Conspiracio (et Capcio)* (Mendal G. Frampton), pp. 920-37.

Thomas Campion's share in *A Booke of Ayres* (Ralph W. Berringer), pp. 938-48.

Inferior lyrics of Part II possibly by Rosseter.

Milton's *Comus* and the *Comus* of Erycius Puteanus (R. H. Singleton), pp. 949-57.

The genesis of John Oldham's *Satyrs upon the Jesuits* (W. M. Williams), pp. 958-70.

The composition of Congreve's first play (John C. Hodges), pp. 971-6.

The paradox of Congreve's *Mourning Bride* (Elmer B. Potter), pp. 977-1001.

Nature to advantage dressed: eighteenth-century acting (Alan S. Downer), pp. 1002-37.

Tony Lumpkin and the country booby type in antecedent English comedy (John Harrington Smith), pp. 1038-49.

The stanza of Rossetti's *The Blessed Damozel* (Elizabeth Jackson), pp. 1050-6.

Whitman the non-Hegelian (Olive Wrenchel Parsons), pp. 1073-93.

Walt Whitman as civil servant (Dixon Wecter), pp. 1094-1109.

The editorial policies of Charles Dickens (Gerald Giles Grubb), pp. 1110-24.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 185, December 4, 1943—

Dickens, Sala and S. C. Hall (T. O. Mabbott), p. 347.

See *N. & Q.*, January 1, 1944, p. 17.

A Note on Pollock's plays (Charles D. Williams), pp. 347-8.

Classification, titles and dates of Pollock's contributions to the Juvenile Drama; see also note by Charles D. Williams *ibid.*, p. 354.

December 18—

Charles Lamb, John Matthie, and Tommy Bye (Samuel McKechnie), pp. 366-7.

Lamb's colleagues in the East India House.

Laetitia Hawkins and Boswell (J. Paul de Castro), pp. 373-4.

Extract from an autograph Diary by Laetitia Hawkins, 1824-7, with reference to Boswell documents at Lichfield.

R. L. Stevenson's *New Poems* (Memorabilist), p. 375.

Errors and misprints in three editions.

Vol. 186, January 1, 1944—

The text of Trollope's *Sir Harry Hotspur* (R.W.C.), pp. 2-3.

An uncollected poem of Sheridan (Alfred Loewenberg), pp. 3-4.

The poem 'O Henry, didst thou know my heart' by Sheridan, not Elizabeth Ann Linley (Mrs. Sheridan); text, with MS. variants.

Daniell: stray notes on the text (Hibernicus), p. 6-8.

Misprints and errors in Grosart's edition.

A note on H. G. Clarke productions (Charles D. Williams), pp. 19-20.

Further information about Juvenile Drama. Note from St. Vincent Troubridge on *Bombastes Furioso*, *N. & Q.*, January 29, p. 79.

NOTES AND QUERIES, January 15—

Remarks on the new "Pope" (G.G.L.), pp. 36-7.

Notes and queries on Twickenham edition, Vol. V.

The Johnson-Boswell correspondence (R. W. Chapman), pp. 45-7.

Additions and corrections to Vol. 185, p. 32.

Wordsworth in Italy (E.B.), p. 48.

Extract from letter from John to Thomas Carlyle, June 12, 1837.

January 29—

Charles Lamb, Bruce de Ponthieu, and Porcher and Co (Samuel McKechnie), p. 71.

Explanation of a reference to these East India Houses of Agency in a letter of Lamb to Dodwell, 1816.

Koresh (W.W.G.), p. 73.

Request for information concerning an American, Koresh, and his 'cellular cosmogony'.

February 12—

The text of Cotton's Poems (Richard Hussey), pp. 87-8.

Errors not corrected in Beresford's edition.

Scott and Jane Austen (R.W.C.), p. 91.

A less familiar version of one of his opinions recorded by Mrs. Mary Anne Hughes, 1824.

Bibliographical discoveries in the work of Richard Jefferies (Samuel J. Looker), pp. 91-2.

The provenance of three essays—*The Spring of the Year*, *Vignettes of Nature*, *The Coming of Summer*.

February 26—

Whitman: notes on Emerson (Olybrius), p. 114.

Notes from an autograph MS. as reproduced in Goodspeed's Catalogue 373, December 1943.

March 11—

A mystery of *Edwin Drood* (D.C.), pp. 131-3.

Problem of the relation of Dickens' story to Robert Lytton's *John Ackland*.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1944—

The rehabilitation of Epicurus and his theory of pleasure in the early Renaissance (Don Cameron Allen), pp. 1-15.

Length of tradition behind 'Epicureanism' of late seventeenth century in England—particularly in Italy.

Latin *restis*, 'rope', 'cord' in English (Charles H. Livingston), pp. 45-9.

Milton's references to Plato and Socrates (Irene Samuel), pp. 50-64.

A considerable number of new references, with a table of allusions.

Anti-stoicism in seventeenth- and early eighteenth-century England (Henry W. Sams), pp. 65-78.

Jonathan Swift and English spelling (J. H. Neumann), pp. 79-85.

Two rival editions of George Whitefield's *Journal*, London, 1738 (George L. Lam and Warren H. Smith), pp. 86-93.

Controversy between Thomas Cooper, publisher, and James Hutton, friend.

Shelley and Claire again (John Harrington Smith), pp. 94-105.

See *P.M.L.A.*, Vol. 54 (1939), pp. 785-814; criticism of views in Newman Ivey White: *Shelley*, N.Y., 1940.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, December 11, 1943—

Pope's 'Angel of Dulness' (M. Willson Disher), p. 595.

On the origin of pantomime.

The Wesleys and others: letters found in salvage (T. Bruce Dilks), p. 600.

Correspondence from John Thickens and C. Ryder Smith, December 25, p. 619;
reply from T. Bruce Dilks, January 8, 1944, p. 19.

December 25—

Robinson Crusoe: Sheridan's Drury Lane pantomime (George H. Nettleton),
p. 624.

Concluded January 1, 1944, p. 12; letter from F. S. Boas, January 29, 1944, p. 60,
from Sybil Rosenfeld, March 4, p. 120.

January 1, 1944—

Thomas Barnes and 'The Champion' (W. M. Parker), p. 7.

Extent of his contributions to this periodical. Reply from Derek Hudson,
January 15, p. 31.

Alethia Lewis (E. P. Shippen), p. 7.

Enquiry concerning a letter written to Crabbe in 1789.

January 8—

Keats's leap-frogging (James R. Sutherland), p. 19.

Identification of 'Little' in letter to Reynolds, May 3, 1818.

The Shaving of Shagpat (Michael Sadleir), p. 24.

Two more variant editions.

Harriet Martineau (Joseph B. Rivlin), p. 24.

Notice of bibliography nearing completion and request for information about
certain scarce titles. Reply from Mildred Martineau, January 22, p. 48.

Lockhart's *Life of Scott* (Vernon Rendall), p. 24.

Corrections of Lockhart.

January 15—

'Cold loin' at Cranford (Dean of Lichfield), p. 36.

Suggestion that 'loin' is an error for 'lion'. Selection from correspondents' letters
approving this correction, January 22, p. 48.

Sir William Temple, pamphleteer (Lawrence Hanson), p. 36.

Identification of 'some small paper . . . in French', written in 1666, with a Sloane
quarto—*Lettre d'un Marchand de Londres*.

January 22—

'Scribble, scribble, scribble' (D. M. Low), p. 43.

Sources and versions of an anecdote about Gibbon and a royal duke. See *T.L.S.*,
November 13, 1943. Reply from Frances Bamford, February 12, 1944, p. 79.

The word 'tantrum' (Lexicographer), p. 43.

Suggested introduction into England by an Irish eighteenth-century playwright.

Emma Robinson, author of *Whitefriars* (Montague Summers), p. 48.

A portrait of William Shenstone (Marjorie Williams), p. 48.

January 29—

Jane Austen's religion (J. R. M. Etherington), p. 55.

References to Evangelical movement in letters. Replies from Q. D. Leavis,
February 5, p. 67, Winifred Schofield, February 12, p. 79, Q. D. Leavis again
February 19, p. 91.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, January 29—

'Drunken Barnaby' (Sec. Lt. Norman Alford, R.A.), p. 60.

Request for information as to a copy of the fourth edition of *Drunken Barnaby's Journal* . . . printed by W. Stuart, 1774.

February 5—

Lockhart's *obiter dicta* (W. M. Parker), p. 72.

Continued February 12, p. 84.

February 12—

William Chillingworth (J. R. Wingfield Digby, S.J.), p. 79.

See *T.L.S.*, January 29, p. 55. Importance of *Life of Lady Falkland* (published 1861) for assessment of Chillingworth's background.

February 19—

Henry King and Robert Berkeley (Dorothy Gardiner), p. 91.

Suggestion that King was the author of an epitaph in Canterbury Cathedral to Robert Berkeley, his father-in-law.

'Most busie lest, when I doe it' (Percy Bacon), p. 96.

See *T.L.S.*, May 8, 1943, p. 228. Further suggestions for interpretation of the passage as it stands.

February 26—

Landor and Alfieri (Malcolm Elwin), p. 103.

Reasons for believing that Landor met Alfieri in 1791, not 1795.

The century of juvenile drama (M. Willson Disher), p. 108.

Information about Hoxton juvenile plays. Letter from Douglas Munro on *The Corsican Brothers*, March 4, p. 115; further details from Montague Summers, March 11, p. 132.

March 4—

Keats and Miss Barnes (M. Buxton Forman), p. 115.

Suggestion that the 'Miss Barnes' of letter to George and Georgiana Keats of March 1819 may be Ann Barnes and a sister of Thomas Barnes the editor; request for information about the trustees of the Thomas Barnes Scholarship.

